

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/messianichopeinb00naso

٧٩٧

PhD
1942
n
copy 1

Approved
by

First Reader Elmer T. Leslie
Professor of
Hebrew and Old Testament Literature

Second Reader Robert H. Pfeiffer
Professor of
Lecturer in Old Testament

FOREWORD

The study that led to the writing of this dissertation was suggested by Professor Elmer A. Leslie of Boston University School of Theology. It was done under his direction and with suggestions made by Professor Robert H. Pfeiffer of Harvard Divinity School. I am grateful to both Professor Leslie and Professor Pfeiffer for suggestions made.

The study has been made with an open mind, and an honest attempt has been made to cast new light upon the problem of the Messianic hope.

All Old Testament references are from the Hebrew Bible. Where the text is quoted my own translation is given. I have taken the liberty of changing the spelling of the name of God in some quotations. In the interest of uniformity, the spelling has been changed from Jahwe, Jahweh, etc., to Yahweh.

All translations from German and French works were made by me.

Inasmuch as the dissertation deals with Old Testament time, all dates mentioned should be understood to be B. C. I have not considered it necessary to use these initials.

OUTLINE

CHAPTER I THE PROBLEM AND PLAN OF THE DISSERTATION Pages 1-14

The Importance of the Messianic hope 1

Its prevalence in the Book of Isaiah 2

The Problem of the dissertation 3

A subject of extensive scholarship 4

Lack of agreement on the subject 5

New investigation needed 7

Justification of the study 8

New data available 8

Recent discoveries at Ras Shamra 9

Definition of terms 10

The plan of the dissertation 13

CHAPTER II THE MESSIANIC HOPE: A PRE-ISAIANIC THOUGHT 15-37

The view of Gunkel 15

" " " Gressmann 16

" " " Oesterley 22

" " " Sellin 26

The "psychological origin" theories 28

A criticism of these views 30

A consideration of some possible Messianic passages 33

The "blessings" passages 33

Genesis 45:7 34

Genesis 49:10 34

Numbers 24:17 35

II Samuel 7:14-16 36

Hosea 3:5 37

CHAPTER III ISAIAH AS THE AUTHOR OF THE MESSIANIC HOPE 38-56

The view of Wellhausen 38

" " " Smend 39

" " " Robertson Smith 39

" " " Guthe 40

" " " Procksch 41

" " " Duhm 41

" " " Welch 43

" " " Louise Smith 46

" " " Whitehouse 50

" " " Skinner 50

An old idea remade by Isaiah 51

Kittel's theory 51

Peters' theory 52

Wade's theory 53

Lack of agreement in these theories 54

No explanation of how the hope arose 55

Arguments in favor of Isaiah as the author 56

CHAPTER IV THE MESSIANIC HOPE: A POST-ISAIANIC DEVELOPMENT 57-79

Tendency to regard all Messianic hope as late 57

The view of Volz 58

" " " Marti 59

" " " Cheyne 61

" " " H. P. Smith 64

" " " Fullerton 65

" " " Torrey 67

" " " Corley 69

" " " Kennett 70

" " " Aytoun 73

" " " Berry 74

Gray leaves the question unsettled 75

Arguments against these theories 76

CHAPTER V THE MESSIANIC HOPE: A NEW APPROACH AND SOLUTION 80-113

The inadequacy of the views studied 80

Meaning of Messiah 81

The purpose of anointing 82

Deification of kings 84

Two approaches to the meaning of kingship 86

Isaiah's attitude toward the kingship 95

His attitude determined by his religious beliefs 96

Isaiah's method of teaching 98

Isaiah's relationship to Ahaz 99

Isaiah's relationship to Hezekiah 100

Isaiah's conflict with Ahaz 102

The Almah-Immanuel sign 103

Shahar and the enigmatic passage, 8:20 107

The meaning of the sign 110

Isaiah's conception of the Messianic hope 111

The names of the Wonder-Child 112

The proclamation of the Messianic oracles 113

CHAPTER VI THE MESSIANIC HOPE IN THE SECOND ISAIAH 114-134

The Second Isaiah and related passages 114

Date 114

Date of Servant Songs 116

The Cyrus reference 117

The Messianic significance of the Servant 119

Identification of the Servant 120

As Jeremiah 122

" Zerubbabel 122

" Jehoiachin 123

" Moses 123

" a mythological figure 124

" Meshullam 126

" Second Isaiah 127

The prophet as Messiah 130

The 'mercies of David' reference 132

CHAPTER VII THE MESSIANIC HOPE IN THE APOCALYPTIC AND SOME OTHER LATE PASSAGES OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH 135-144

Apocalyptic passages in Isaiah 135

Difficulty of definite dating 135

No clear expression of the Messianic hope 136

Relationship of Messianic and apocalyptic prophecy 136

Isaiah 24-27 137

Isaiah 34-35 138

Isaiah 59 139

Isaiah 11:11-16 139

Isaiah 2:24 140

Isaiah 4:2-6 142

Reasons for the absence of the Messianic hope 143

CHAPTER I THE PROBLEM AND PLAN OF THE DISSERTATION

The subject known among Old Testament scholars as the Messianic hope, occupies a large place in the study of Old Testament religion. In the minds of many it holds the place of supreme importance. Briggs calls it "the most important of all themes."[1] König speaks of it as the "finest flower of Old Testament religion."[2] Peters thinks it is "the most striking and characteristic feature of the religion of Israel."[3] "The fundamental characteristic of Hebrew thought is the ethical optimism which is best seen in the Messianic hope," says Goodspeed.[4] Fullerton reminds us that it is the "Messianic idea which has played the leading role in ecclesiastical exegesis of the Old Testament."[5]

The importance of this doctrine is readily seen when one considers its influence upon the Jews during the closing centuries of the Old Testament era and subsequent time. For more than twenty-five hundred years they have cherished the hope of restoration as a world power. We could hardly go so far as to identify this hope with the Messianic expectation. The former has often been so nationalistic in spirit as to make itself quite the opposite of what we find in the loftiest

---

1. Messianic Prophecy. P. vii.
2. Messianischen Weissagungen. P. 5.
3. The Religion of the Hebrews. P. 425.
4. Israel's Messianic Hope. P. 1.
5. "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah." JBL Vol. 41, P2.

expression of the Messianic hope. Be that as it may, the underlying idea of this expectation of ultimate restoration is an outgrowth of the Messianic hope. Cornill goes so far as to say that "all the efforts of later Judaism to make itself worthy of God had their origin in this hope."[1]

The Messianic hope has been criticized adversely on the grounds that it reflects a narrow nationalistic spirit. Such criticism is ungrounded, and due to a misunderstanding of the original significance of this hope. It has been adequately answered by Dahl.

> There is a fairly common impression that the Messianic hope represents a somewhat narrow kind of fierce nationalism, a blot upon Israel's religious life rather than its chief ornament and glory.....The higher type of Messianism represents the very acme of Hebrew religious thought. In view of the notable volume and especially the peerless quality of the literature it inspired, as well as because of the intrinsic worth of its animating ideas, this is far from being something for which one need apologize.[2]

In no book of the Old Testament is the Messianic hope set forth as often and as definitely as in the book of Isaiah. It is here that we find the doctrine first clearly expressed, and here also we find it in its fullest development. It is to this book, therefore, that we are most often referred in discussion of this subject. Here we find a number of questions arising. Whence came the idea? Was it the outgrowth of other ideas that lay back of it? Did the Hebrews borrow it from some other people, or did it come out of Israel's own history?

---

1. Cornill. The Prophets of Israel. P. 159.

2. "The Messianic Expectation in the Psalter." JBL. Vol. 57 P. 6.

Did it have a religious, a psychological or an historical origin? When did it first appear in Old Testament history? And what was its significance when it did appear there? Such are some of the questions that scholars have sought to answer, but they do not cover the entire problem. Even if it can be shown as some claim it can be, that the Messianic hope arose out of mythology, or a developing eschatology, we still have the problem of why the prophets made use of this idea. How did it find the place it now occupies in their books?

One difficulty that faces us is that of finding any established date in the book from which to work. Isaiah's call came in "the year that King Uzziah died" but there is nothing mentioned in connection with his call that throws light directly upon the Messianic ideas of the book. In fact the commission which he received in conjunction with his call has been used as an argument that Isaiah could not have been a prophet of hope.[1] The "Immanuel" prophecy is definitely from the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic war, but the Messianic content of the passage is widely denied.

The difficulty created by Hebrew tenses also adds to our problem. The use of the perfect tense to denote past or present time, or its prophetic perfect use to denote the future, often makes it impossible to tell whether an event has taken place, is taking place, or is about to take place; e.g. when we read of the seeing of the great light and the birth of the wondrous child of 9:1ff does it mean they have taken place, or they will take place in the future, or that the seeing of

---

1. 6:9-10.

the light is in the past and the birth of the child in the future?[1]

This topic has been the subject of extensive scholarship. The very prominence of the idea compels one who would know the Old Testament to face the problem sooner or later. Much of this has been in connection with the broader subject of Old Testament religion. Some, however, have found this a great subject of study in and of itself. One of the most extensive of these studies was made by Hugo Gressmann. The result of his study was published in his Der Messias, in 1929. This was a complete revision of an earlier book, Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie, published in 1905. As a background to Gressmann's study, Gunkel's Schöpfung und Chaos, published in 1895, should be mentioned. Among English scholars the works of C. A. Briggs[2] and W. O. E. Oesterley[3] are outstanding, the latter, however, limiting himself to a study of the origin of the Messianic idea. As for American scholarship in this field, it thus far consists mainly of more limited studies, the results of which are to be found in periodical literature. A full discussion of these studies will be made at a later point in this dissertation.

In spite of the extensive scholarship in this field, there is no unanimity of opinion. Scholars differ widely as to the origin of the Messianic hope, and the place that it occupies in Israel's thought.

---

1. Cf. Micklem. Prophecy And Eschatology P. 156.

2. Messianic Prophecy.

3. The Evolution of the Messianic Idea.

On the one hand we find some saying that this hope could not possible have arisen previous to the downfall of the Davidic dynasty, while others find it a fully developed idea of pre-exilic Hebrew thought. While some think of this idea as having come to Israel from other lands, others find it to have been a development within Israel itself.

Coming to our own topic of the history of the idea as expressed in the book of Isaiah, we are told that Isaiah ben Amoz was a prophet of doom and that all expressions of hope for the future found in chapters 1-39 are, therefore, interpolations.[1] Yet Kittel thinks that "Isaiah is in a special sense the creator of the Messianic idea,"[2] and Welch says that this idea is "fundamental to Isaiah's conception of the divine nature."[3] Furthermore, there is a wide difference of opinion as to what passages in the book are Messianic. For example, Fullerton says that "32:1ff need not be considered since the Messianic interpretation (of this passage) is now generally given up,"[4] while Micklem finds this the one Messianic passage which without improbability might be ascribed to Isaiah.[5]

The Immanuel passage, 7:14ff has been much in dispute. Does it or does it not have Messianic significance? Something of the problem of the passage is brought out by Edghill in his discussion of it:

---

1. Volz, Fullerton, Kennett, etc.

2. Kittel, Scientific Study of the Old Testament. P. 239.

3. Welch, The Religion of Israel Under The Kingdom. P. 180.

4. "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah." P. 7.

5. Micklem Op. Cit. P. 160.

> Immanuel may therefore be identified with the Messiah, but it must not be denied that there are many difficulties in the way of this identification-in particular, perhaps, the fact that the birth of the two children as well as their history appears to presuppose a different time and different surroundings. Of one thing, however, we may be certain. It is impossible to evacuate the birth and name of Immanuel of all Messianic significance. If not the Messiah himself he is at least the leader and embodiment of that new generation from the midst of which the Messiah should finally spring.[1]

Quite recently there has been a revival of interest in the possible Messianic content of this passage which may serve to throw new light upon the origin of the Messianic hope.

There is not only a lack of agreement among scholars as to the genuineness of the Messianic oracles in Isaiah, but, strange to say, the reason given by one for denying Isaianic authorship is practically the same reason given by another in support of such authorship. A comparison of the following two quotations will show this. Of Isaiah 9:1-6, Kennett says:

> Isaiah 9:1-6, which in its most natural interpretation describes a deliverance and a victory already realized, is not related to anything in the history of Isaiah's time, and linguistic considerations also.....imply a date much later than the time of Isaiah.[2]

On the other hand we find Gressmann saying of this same passage:

> Some have denied this promise to Isaiah and placed it in the post-exilic time. This dating is impossible, because then quite other events would have been emphasized. After the Exile there was no passionate desire but to return to the homeland, and to collect the scattered Diaspora, to settle again in the land and to build up the destroyed Jerusalem. The kingdom of Judah still exists and is to be supported. Moreover the prophet hoped only for the destruction of the tyrant and his might. He compared the Day of Yahweh with

---

1. Enquiry Into The Evidential Value Of Prophecy P. 382.

2. Old Testament Essays P. 228.

> the victory of Gideon over Midian, a proof, therefore, that in the first instance it did not deal with the casting off of a foreign ruler, but with the repulsion of a wicked enemy. All this supports the time of Sennacherib, which by the assault of the Assyrians and their implements of war was as dangerous to the existence of Israel as the invasion of the Midianites once had been.[1]

A further difference of opinion is to be found in the discussion of our subject as it is contained in the parts of the book known as the Second and Third Isaiah. What is the connection between "the Servant" and "the Messiah?" Here the discussion varies from the dogmatic statement that the "Servant is in no sense Messianic, to the idea of Torrey that the "Messianic hope was the "underlying stratum" of this entire prophecy.[2]

New investigation is always apropos to any question that has engaged the minds of scholars as extensively as our subject. The above mentioned problem, together with the wide differences of opinion, however, make investigation in this field more than apropos. A fresh treatment of the subject is very much needed. It was a sense of the need for further investigation in this field that led Briggs to say at the conclusion of his study:

> The author has devoted many years of study in preparation for the present work. It has cost him more labour than all other topics combined.....And yet the theme is so great, so wonderful, so glorious, and so divine, that he has pursued it only to find that it has escaped his grasp and transcends his efforts. He gives his work to the world because he is convinced that a fresh study of the whole subject is greatly needed, and because he is assured that he has a contribution to make to its further discussion.[3]

---

1. Der Messias. P. 244.

2. Case. Studies in Early Christianity. P. 285.

3. Messianic Prophecy. P. xv.

The question immediately arises, "What will justify such a new investigation?" Has recent scholarship any new light to throw upon the subject? It is the belief of the writer that it has. The following words of Welch are even more true today than when they were written:

> I think we are learning to open our eyes to the fact that the world of Jewish thought was richer in its ideas and more varied in the coloring given to these ideas than it has hitherto been customary to recognize.[1]

Recently a new approach to the whole subject of Old Testament religion has been made as it is seen "in the light of its Canaanite background."[2] Recent excavations made in Palestine and neighboring lands have brought us valuable knowledge of religions that may have greatly influenced the religion of Israel. Writing upon the subject of the real religion of ancient Israel, Kraeling says:

> We are accustomed to view the religion of Israel in the light of the great prophetic utterances and to consider this prophetic religion as being confronted by a debased popular religion, full of superstitions, beliefs and practices. But it may be asserted with some confidence that while there was, indeed a religion of the prophets, no such thing as a prophetic religion exists in Israel. The prophets stand forth as great individuals who rise above the absorbing processes of the group with a new and great experience of God.[3]

This has led to a whole new consideration of the origins and development of Hebrew religion with its accompanying cultures. It has furnished us new data on the rôle played by Hebrew kings, and thus, indirectly, given us new light on the possible origin and development of the Messianic idea.

---

1. The Religion of Israel Under the Kingdom. P. 164.

2. E. A. Leslie.

3. JBL Vol. 47 P. 133.

The most important archaeological discovery, so far as our subject is concerned is that made at Ras Shamra in 1929. Here fragments of clay tablets were discovered which are thought to have come from the fourteenth century B. C. These were deciphered by Dr. Hans Bauer and P. Dhorme near the end of 1930 and found to be largely myth and ritual material relating to the religion of ancient Canaan. Acording to Virolleaud.[1] the tablets contain two distinct myths,[2] though the two are not related. One poem, known as Poem C, and called by Virolleaud, "The Birth Of The Gracious and Beautiful Gods," contains expressions which may have a close relationship to some of Isaiah's Messianic material. The possibility of this relationship was realized by Graham and published in 1934. At the conclusion of the article, Graham says:

> In the next few years students of the Old Testament will possibly busy themselves vastly with a re-examination of the origins of Messianism and the process of its development into a true and highly complex eschatology. Such labors may upset some critical conventions concerning the date of a good deal of literature and may establish the fact that the failure of the cultural school up to the present time to revivify a criticism which has fast been drifting into the complacent rigidity which preceded extinction has been due more to faulty methodology than to fundamental error in hypothesis. In any case there will be plenty of absorbingly interesting problems to engage those who, in the coming years, will take up the task of pushing on to its proper conclusion the great work of the founder of Biblical criticism.[3]

Another question which might be asked is, "Why study the history of the Messianic hope in the book of Isaiah?" To this there are two answers,

---

1. Syria Vol. 12 Pp. 193-224.

2."The Hunting of Baal,"and"Mot and Aleion."

3."Cultural Origin of the Hebrews"JR. Vol. 14. P. 329.

the first of which has already been given, the fact that the Messianic hope is set forth more definitely and more frequently in this book than in any other of the whole Old Testament. Oesterley, in his study, "The Evolution of the Messianic Idea," found that "The Isaianic teaching on this subject contains all the most essential points."[1] The second answer is that the book of Isaiah is a compilation of prophetic material covering a period of three hundred and fifty years and possibly much longer.[2] Moreover, the book covers a very important period of Old Testament history, during which we have the prophetic purification of Hebrew religion, the writing of the Deuteronomic Law and its accompanying reform, the exile and the return, the rise of Judaism, and the writing of the Priestly Law. In other words it covers a period that gave rise to a large part of our Old Testament literature.

It will be necessary in this investigation to keep clearly in mind what is meant by the terms, the Messianic hope, Messianic prophecy, and the Messiah. This is a complex subject and there is a difference of opinion among scholars as to what these expressions mean. A definition of terms is, therefore, in order.

We derive the term, "Messianic," from the Hebrew root, מָשַׁח, which means, "to stroke with the hand," hence "to anoint." This term is used in Old Testament scholarship in a twofold sense. In its broader

---

1. P. 239.

2. Kennett dates the final compilation of the book ca. 140, and thinks it contains material nearly as late as that date. Duhm and Marti place chapters 24-27 as late as the end of the reign of John Hyrcanus, or the beginning of that of Alexander Jannaeus, between 128 and 111.

sense it is used to refer to the coming of the golden age. In this sense the Messianic hope becomes merely another expression for the eschatology of hope and all prophecy setting forth this eschatology becomes Messianic prophecy. In the narrower sense it has to do with the New Age which is made possible through the work of the Messiah. This is the sense in which it is used in this dissertation. The author believes that Kennett is right in saying:

> We have no right to call a passage Messianic simply because it gives expression to a hope that a good time is coming, unless that good time is brought about by one who is the Lord's Anointed.[1]

The noun, מָשִׁיחַ, Messiah, is used in the Old Testament in reference to the king who is called "The Anointed" or "Messiah" of Yahweh.[2] Other uses are in reference to the High Priest,[3] to Cyrus,[4] to the Messianic prince,[5] and to the patriarchs.[6] The practice of anointing was considered to bring one into special relationship to Yahweh. A more thorough treatment of this rite with its accompanying significance will be given in chapter five of this dissertation. It should be said here that we are not to consider the Messiah in the broad sense of anyone who is in a special relationship to God through having been anointed, but in the sense of a special agent of God whose work it is to usher in

---

1. Old Testament Essays. P. 224.
2. I Sam. 2:10, 35, 24:7, 11. Hab. 3:13.
3. Lev. 4:3, 5, 16.
4. Isa. 45:1.
5. Dan. 9:25, 26.
6. Ps. 105:15.

the Messianic era, an age of righteousness and peace. This Messiah is not necessarily always a king. On the other hand, the king who brings about the New Age is seldom, if ever, called the Messiah in the Old Testament. There are but two references which could be so interpreted and both are open to question.[2]

In keeping with the foregoing definitions, in our study of the history of the Messianic hope in the book of Isaiah, we shall consider as Messianic prophecy those oracles which have to do with the New Age ushered in by the Messiah. Hope for the future will be considered Messianic only when it is contingent upon the work of the Messiah. This Messiah must be one who is in some unique relationship to God, but need not always be thought of as a king. This dissertation is to deal with the history of the Messianic hope in the book of Isaiah. Mention has already been made that the book of Isaiah is a compilation. This fact is so generally accepted by Old Testament scholarship today that it does not need treatment here. Inasmuch as we are to face the question whether the prophet Isaiah is the author of certain Messianic oracles, in referring to the portion of the book that contains those oracles, we shall use the phrase, Isaiah 1-39. This will make allowance for the fact that part of that division of the book are not from the prophet's hand at all. Chapters 24-27 and other fragments of this section are accepted as late apocalyptic literature. The term, Second Isaiah, will be used of the prophecy contained in chapters 40-55. Chapters 55-66 are not

---

1. Isa. 61:1

2. Ps. 2:2, Isa. 45:1. Skinner. Cambridge Bible. Isa. 40-66. P. 64.

considered as a unit,[1] and will be considered in connection with Second Isaiah and the apocalyptic sections.

In the dissertation the results of a survey of the contributions of critical scholarship toward a solution of our problem will first be given. This will be presented in three chapters. The first will give a summary of views which hold the opinion that the Messianic hope is older than the eighth century. The second will deal with theories that look upon Isaiah as the author of the hope. The third will have to do with scholarship that finds the origin of the hope later than the eighth century. In each case a general criticism of the theories will be given.

It may be noticed that some works mentioned elsewhere in the dissertation are not dealt with here. In every case, however, there has been reason for such omission. Little reference is made to the works of Briggs[2] and Riehm.[3] These were both undoubtedly critical treatments of our subject when written but they can hardly be considered such any longer. The same may be said of Delitzsch's treatment of the subject in his commentary on Isaiah. Likewise the views of Kŏnig[4] and Condamin[5] may be said to be scientific but too conservative to be considered as critical scholarship.

The fifth chapter of the dissertation will deal with the author's own theory of the origin of the Messianic hope. The problem will be ap-

---

1. Following Eissfeldt. Einleitung in Das A. T. P.384f.
2. Messianic Prophecy.
3. Die Messianische Weissagung.
4. Die Messianischen Weissagungen.
5. Le livre D'Isaïe.

proached both from the historical and religious standpoint. Do the Messianic oracles of Isaiah 1-39 fit into any historical situation of the prophet's day? And are they in harmony with his religious views? The writer believes that only by the dual approach can the problem be solved. Too frequently the problem has been approached from the historical standpoint alone. McFadyen, for example, tells us that, "The most scientific study would be an historical study."[1] Such an approach fails to recognize the fact that the prophets were primarily interested in religion, or in other words that they believed that the events of history were determined by Israel's relationship to God.

In the sixth chapter we shall face the question of the presence of the Messianic hope in the Second Isaiah and related prophecy. An attempt will then be made to relate this to the findings of the preceding chapter. In chapter seven the same procedure will be followed in regard to the apocalyptic and any other later sections of the book. Finally, a brief digest of the entire dissertation will be given.

---

1. ABC P. 177.

CHAPTER II THE MESSIANIC HOPE: A PRE-ISAIANIC THOUGHT.

Any full treatment of our subject necessitates a consideration of whether the Messianic hope existed previous to the time of Isaiah. If Isaiah made use of an already existing idea, as some have held, then we must attempt to find the origin of that idea, and the extent to which it existed in Israel's life previous to Isaiah's time. In this chapter we shall consider first the contribution of Gunkel and Gressmann, who find the origin of the Messianic hope as a part of an eschatology which developed from a mythology borrowed by Israel from other people. Secondly we shall consider Oesterley's theory, which also finds a mythological origin of the idea, but from within Israel itself. Then it will be necessary to consider other early-origin views. Finally, we must give consideration to certain Old Testament passages which have been widely accepted as Messianic in content and are reputed to antedate Isaiah.

Gunkel opened the way to a new field of thought when he suggested that certain ideas and expressions found in the Old Testament can be understood only when considered in a larger context of extra Biblical material. He pointed out that many Biblical passages, particularly in Genesis, have a close affinity to Babylonian Cosmology. In pursuing his method of study Gunkel came to feel the prophets made use of this mythological material. They did not necessarily accept for themselves all the thought contained in the mythological material, but took over this material and made it a medium for expressing their own ideas.

In later times the sense in which the prophets used the material was forgotten, and thereby different conceptions became attached to it.

> The prophets were great enough to take once for all a poetic view toward such material for this purpose of vividly setting forth a vision. Moreover, they would have held toward such a heathen history a certain reserve. This frame of mind was first altered as these myths became strongly Hebraized by the public and the disciples of the prophets.[1]

Thus it is that some ideas now found only in late portions of the Bible, and for that reason held to be late, had really had a long history in Hebrew literature and tradition. This is especially true of some of the Messianic material. Of the picture in Isaiah 11:1ff, Gunkel says:

> This description may not be regarded as an invention of the prophet. If it were it would be extraordinarily fantastic, and in the mouth of a man like Isaiah almost incomprehensible. Its meaning becomes clear only when it is recognized that the prophet is utilizing for his own purposes material which had been handed down by tradition. He is citing here the well-known myth of the Golden Age.[2]

He suggested that his method should be applied to a study of the whole field of Hebrew eschatology.

The suggestion made by Gunkel was carried out by Gressmann in his study of the sources of Hebrew eschatology. The latter's conclusion is that eschatology developed in Israel along two contrary lines: the one of doom (Unheils), and the other of hope (Heils).[3] Each of these eschatologies developed apart from the other.

---

1. Schöpfung und Chaos P. 162

2. Ibid P. 13

3. In prehistoric times there existed a myth of the destruction of the world and subsequent restoration. Both the eschatology of doom and of hope go back to that myth.

The contradictions of hopes and threats to be found in prophecy are due to this fundamental opposition of the eschatology of doom to that of hope.[1] To the eschatology of doom belongs the doctrine of the remnant; to that of hope the idea of the Messiah.[2] Thus by the time these two eschatologies had reached the prophets their original meaning had been lost.

The use of these two eschatologies, as found in literary prophecy, began with Amos.[3] Previous to his day the prophecy of doom was directed against the nations. Beginning with him it is turned toward Israel. Thus "in all pre-exilic literature until Ezekiel two groups of prophets can be pointed out which are in a state of embittered conflict."[4] The prophets of doom always remain in the minority, because only those who prophesy fortune can count upon the sympathy of the people and the king. But in the pre-exilic, literary prophets we find more prophecies of doom than of hope since their chief theme was to make clear to Israel that the expected catastrophe belonged in the first place to Israel herself and not to the heathen. Therefore threats must necessarily outweigh promises. But while the chief message of these prophets was doom they were, nevertheless, human beings who at times accepted the popular eschatology.[5] For that reason there are two questions we must keep in mind: (1) What ideas has the prophet taken from others? (2) To what

---

1. "Die Drohungen verkündet Unheils, die Verheissungen Heils fur Israel." Der Messias. P. 69
2. Der Ursprung P. 242ff. Der Messias P. 77ff.
3. Der Messias P. 82
4. Ibid P. 77 Cf. Micaiah ben Imlah vs. the 400 I Kg. 22.
5. Der Ursprung P. 242ff. Der Messias P. 94ff. AJT. Vol 17 P. 173ff.

extent and in what way has he adapted them to the actual situation?

There is no reason, thinks Gressmann, why there cannot be both threats and promises in prophecy. The prophet does not give both at one and the same time. The conjunction of the two as we now find them in the Scripture is purely arbitrary. It is easy to find the connecting sentences that unite the two, but to insist, therefore, that the prophecies of hope are not genuine is to misunderstand the message of the prophets completely.

> If the prophets were only announcers of calamity, had they only come to ruin and demolish, then was their God an enigmatical God and his doing was as senseless as the work of a peasant who is always ploughing and never seeding.[1]

Gressmann argues that the prophets were poets who spoke out of deep emotion. We must keep this in mind in attempting to interpret them. The principles of higher criticism cannot always be applied to them as it can to the Hexateuch. Rather we must single out each prophetic poem and interpret it by itself. To do this two phrases will be helpful. "Thus Yahweh has spoken" is usually at the beginning of a poem, and "For the mouth of Yahweh has spoken it," is frequently added at the end.

In pre-prophetic and extra-prophetic pre-exilic literature the only references to the Messiah are in Genesis 49 and Numbers 24. These are not directly Messianic, but only in a traditional sense. The most they do is to "celebrate David as the promised ideal king of the end of time."[2]

---

1. AJT Vol. 17 P. 178

2. Der Messias P. 230

The idea of an ideal king for the end of time is a natural supplement to the idea of an ideal king in primitive time. But Israel knows no paradise king.

> No one has dared by an alteration of tradition to elevate Moses or Joshua to kingship, much less the first man. The idea of a primitive king could have originated only among a people whose kingdom was rooted in an ancient time that could not have presented a life without a king, and therefore must necessarily have presented the first person as the first king. The ideal king at the end of time as the ideal king of the beginning of time must be of foreign origin.[1]

Gressmann believes that Israel took over the idea of an ideal king for the end of time during the time between Gideon and David. In doing this Israel was merely following the practice of other eastern states. They had kings with power. Israel was of humble origin, and had no king. The lack, however, was made up by spiritual love for the fatherland, and a burning political ambition which could not even be satisfied with achievement. Israel desired to be a leader in the world and was convinced of her own worth and her own ability. "Why should she not hope for a future king, who would extend the kingdom to the ends of the world and win for herself the eternal glory of a world superior?"[2]

Such was the mother earth upon which the Messianic hope could grow. So, even before Israel had become a monarchy, she began to think of the day when she would be the leading nation of the world, ruled over by a great king. The logical outcome of this longing was a belief in a great king for the end of time. Nor was this belief hard to acquire. All that Israel had to do was to borrow it from another people.

---

1. Der Messias. P. 231.

2. Ibid. P. 230

The Israelites probably borrowed the Messianic hope from the Amorites. In Psalm 110 Melchizedek appears as the forefather of the Jerusalem dynasty and therefore perhaps as the original king and Messiah, although of this we cannot be certain. However, the Amorites were not the creators of the hope. It came out of Egypt.

The fullest expression of the Messianic hope is found by Gressmann in the book of Isaiah. He reminds us that the thought of Isaiah relatively seldom deals with the political events and battles, but instead with the catastrophes of nature, but that the two are so blended by the prophet that it is difficult to separate the one from the other. Since, however, only the political aspect answers fully to the historical situation, one can sense in the nature element a foreign body which can be ascribed to an old tradition. Thus the eschatology is the older of the two elements.[1]

He also finds three consecutive stages in the development of the idea of the Messianic king, and each of these stages has a mythological background. The first is that of a divine child bringing peace to Israel at birth. It is given in the Immanuel prophecy, Isaiah 7:10-17, in which Isaiah makes use of an already known eschatological figure. Unless the figure of Immanuel was already known the sign would have meant nothing to Ahaz.

> The miracle can exist only in the birth of the child, Immanuel, for the oracle contains no other miracle. Immanuel is therefore the Messias, with whom the days of fortune for Judah must begin after a time of terrible misfortune has preceded. It was the greatness of

---

1. Der Messias P. 144f.

the need which gave certainty to the prophet that the Messiah was already conceived.[1]

It is obvious that those who wrote down this oracle thought of it as being a promise for Judah but a threat against Ahaz.[2] Milk and honey, as the food of the gods, will be the food of the Messiah. Hence, when Immanuel eats, the Messianic era will have come. According to Gressmann, the two traits, the mother and the food "disprove the usual interpretation of Immanuel being a creation of Isaiah to make evident the shortness of time."[3]

The second stage of the development of the idea is that of a being with divine epithets and functions.[4] Gressmann finds traces in Israel of the kings being extolled like gods.[5] But the prophets who defied kings would never have given a king such divine epithets as אֵל גִּבּוֹר and אֲבִי עַד. Such titles must have been borrowed as well as the institution of kingship itself from another people. If the passage spoke only of a king who should break the yoke of the enemy, it might be considered the creation of Isaiah. But what of a situation where there would be no more war? This demands a complete conversion of man and civilization which cannot be explained psychologically either by the situation of the contemporary or the future time. Not only are the ideas here not Isaiah's, the passage is too loosely put together to belong to him.

---

1. Der Messias P. 238f.
2. Ibid P. 181.
3. AJT. Vol 17 P. 181
4. 9:1-6
5. Ps. 2, 45, 110.

What Isaiah did was to take over already existing eschatological material and make it his own.

The third stage is that of a David redividus ruling at the end of time.[1] The reference, בֵּית דָּוִד must signify a returned David. If a prince of "the House of David" had been meant the reference to Jesse is meaningless.[2] The figure here is a sort of half-god, made such by the reception of the seven-fold spirit. He needs neither scepter, nor body guard, nor executioner to carry out his judgment. A word of his mouth is sufficient to destroy evil. The result will be the uprooting of all evil, both in nature and in humanity.

To argue that this passage is post-exilic because of the Hebrew word, חֹטֶר, is erroneaous. The same word is used in Isaiah 40:24 to refer to a young cutting, planted in the ground. Moreover, the use of the expression, the root of Jesse, in Isaiah 11:10 shows that when there used it had become a terminus technicus only by having been in use a long time. It refers back to the expression in 11:1 which must be older, and may be regarded as Isaianic. Here as in 9:1-16, Isaiah is not giving his own ideas, but making use of an existing eschatological idea.

An approach to an understanding of the Messianic hope similar to that of Gressmann, but with different conslusions, has been made by Oesterley.[3] Man's spiritual development is the basis of his study.

---

1. 11:1-8

2. Der Messias. P. 246.

3. Evolution of the Messianic Idea.

He postulates three myths[1] which in their earliest forms were "the expression of emotions which are innate in human nature."[2] The first of these myths came from primitive man's pessimism and sensations of fear, the second from his feeling of dependence, and the third from his desire to be happy. One of the greatest sources of fear to primitive man was water, the raging sea, heavy rainfall, floods, etc. These evils, he believed were the works of a cruel monster of the sea. Naturally this cruel monster could have wrought greater harm than he did. The fact that he did not, had to be explained, and the explanation reached was that a "Bringer of blessings" warred against the monster in behalf of human kind. The monster was overcome, but not completely conquered. He continued his evil work. Man's desire to be happy led to day dreaming, and the eventual development of a tradition that, what he longed for had one day actually existed. Thus there grew up the three myths which appear in the Old Testament "in their highly developed guise" as the Tehom, and Yahweh, and the Paradise myths. Similar myths were found to exist in the literature and traditions of many different peoples.

Oesterley treats each of these myths as it is found in the Old Testament at some length. He cites a number of scripture references in

---

1. Tehom Myth. Gen. 1:2, 2:4ff. Am. 9:36, Isa. 27:1, 30:7, 51:9,10; Ps.74: 12-15, 89:9-11, Job 26:12-13, 40:25-41:26.
   Jahwe Myth. Gen. 2:5-7, 19. Isa. 51:9-11. Ps. 65:28, 74:12-17, 89:6-19, 104:5-9.
   Paradise Myth. Gen. 2:8-13. Ps. 48:2-4. Ezek. 28:13-15. Isa. 2:2-4. (Micah 4:1-3). Isa. 11:1-9, 35:1-10.
   Chosen from many that actually existed since these three only have bearing upon this subject.

2. Evolution of the Messianic Idea. P. 162.

support of each. His supposition is that the presence of these myths in such a wide range of literature proves them the common possession of mankind. When they appear in the Old Testament, therefore, "the writers were making use of material which had been floating for milleniums." At the time it was used by the Old Testament writers, it had been handed down for many generations, and was "regarded with great veneration, and looked upon as a sacred heritage."[1] This fact, Oesterley thinks, is proved by the "antique traits" and "naïve conceptions" which are prevalent in such passages. The fact that these ancient elements are really out of place in many cases, and are alien to the spirit of the context, and in some cases are meaningless unless their antique character is recognized,-all this goes to establish the fact that the Old Testament writers were making use of well known, pre-existing material, which they adapted to higher teaching. As a more spiritual conception of life developed some of these myth elements became offensive to later writers, but some had so lost their original meaning that there was no reason to delete them.

The primeval monster appears in the Old Testament under the titles of Tehom Rabbah, Serpent, Dragon, Leviathan, and Rahab. The character represented by these titles is the enemy of God. The "Heilbringer" or "Saviour-Hero" who fights this monster is Yahweh. As such Yahweh appears as a semi-divine being. The transference to Yahweh of deeds that in this floating myth material were originally enacted by the primeval Saviour-Hero attributes to Him actions that

---

1. Evolution of the Messianic Idea. P. 162.

appeared derogatory to a later age, hence the "toning-down process which is often observable in the Old Testament."[1] The paradise myth had to do both with the distant past and the future. It told of a time when the gods and men lived together in happiness in a time of universal peace. Food was abundant and there was no need. Even the animals lived together in peace. A just ruler, a divine personality with some human characteristics, presided over this community. Eventually there would be a return of this happy era. As these three myths appear in the Old Testament they are interwoven and interdependent.

Oesterly applies his theory to four selected passages from Isaiah 2:2-4, 4:2-6, 9:5-6, and 11:1-5. The conclusions he reaches from this study are worthy of our consideration. In the expression of the Messianic idea as we find it in these four passages Oesterley feels that we have an example of the evolution of this idea. In the first passage Yahweh Himself is the Messianic ruler. Thus we have here the idea of a ruler who is wholly divine, and all nations are included among His subjects. In the second passage Yahweh is still the Messianic ruler, but the situation had changed from that in 2:2-4. Yahweh's presence on earth is indicated by the Shekhinah and his subjects are now limited to the purified children of Israel. Here a new thought, the Branch of Yahweh, appears. The third passage gives us a clear-cut presentation of a divine-human ruler. The link between this passage and what goes before is found in the Immanuel reference, 7:14, which Oesterley thinks

---

1. Ibid P. 166.

2. Ibid P. 236ff.

is otherwise not Messianic. The climax of the idea is found in the last passage. Here we have a purely human ruler, but one upon whom the Spirit of Yahweh rests in a unique way. He is a descendent of Jesse, and his subjects are restricted thereby to the Children of Israel.

This development of the Messianic idea is due, Oesterley thinks, to the change which took place in Isaiah's theology. At first the prophet believed in the actual, visible presence of Yahweh as ruler among men, whose reign would usher in an era of universal peace and righteousness. The prophet's growing realization of the "transcendent majesty and glory of God" caused him to see how incongruous Yahweh's actual presence among sinful men would be. At first this incongruity was solved by the idea of a righteous remnant among whom Yahweh could live. The real solution, however, came with the idea of Yahweh's representative, the Messiah, who would bridge the gap between God and man. Isaiah had a special reason for connecting the Messiah with the House of David, though Oesterley does not mention what that reason was.

Still another approach to an understanding of our problem is that made by Sellin. He previously held to an exilic date for the Messianic hope. Now, influenced by the Gunkel-Gressmann theory, he has abondoned that view in favor of the genuineness of the Isaianic prophecies. He now thinks that the genuineness of 9:1-6 and 11:1-9 "in spite of much contesting can be considered proved."[1] However, he departs from Gressmann's view in an attempt to solve what he feels is a real weakness in the latter's theory. Sellin feels that the attempt to prove

---

1. Israelitisch-jüdische Religionsgeschichte. P. 78.

that eschatology is pre-prophetic because of its mythological character is unsound. He feels it unlikely that the prophets would have drawn as extensively upon mythological material. Hence, he rejected Gressmann's idea of a primeval eschatological myth, fragments of which came down to Israel. In its place he found the origin of eschatology in the experience of Yahweh's revelation of Himself at Sinai. It was there that the germinal hope that Yahweh would again appear in the future for the purpose of beginning His world rule was implanted deep in the hearts of the people.

> So this religion from the hour of its birth was most intimately related with and established upon, hope. Yahweh at Sinai became king of His people. Thus they strove toward a land where this kingdom could attain outward reality. They reached it and the battle for the same began. And even as a greater part of these people believed it to be certain that Yahweh had returned with them to the homeland, so the more fiercely the enemy appeard, the more they became accustomed to raise their eyes longingly again to the mountain from which help had once come. There, under the most wonderful phenomenon of nature, the election had taken place, and the greater the might of the enemy became, the more definitely they hoped that this event would be repeated in the same or a more powerful way. So Israel learned to wait for the intervening God.[1]

As the more thoughtful among the Israelites reflected upon the revelation at Sinai they realized that the complete manifestation of Yahweh's kingship was yet to come. When Yahweh was king in a complete sense he would act as Judge and Saviour. Herein Sellin finds the basis of the opposing eschatologies of doom and hope. These two eschatologies, however, are united in the idea of one Being who is both Judge and Saviour.

Sellin finds the roots of the doctrine of a Messiah in the ancient oriental conception of a paradise king. This he finds in extra-Biblical

---

1. Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus. P. 184.

material. Proof of the ancient character of the Messianic hope is sought in a consideration of three groups of passages: (1) Isaiah 7:14, 9:1ff, 11:1ff. (2) the royal psalms which can be explained only by saying that the eschatological style has been adapted into court style. Therefore, since royal psalms must be pre-exilic, the eschatology contained in them must be still older. (3) Such passages as 49:10, the Balaam oracles, and Deuteronomy 33:1ff.

According to Sellin Isaiah set much of his own eschatology into the sharpest antithesis to popular eschatology, but in the case of the Messiah this was not done. Instead Isaiah gave this hope ethical emphasis. The entire government of the eschatological king was founded not upon riches and military might, but upon justice and righteousness. A national emphasis appears not only in 2:1ff, but in the more narrowly Messianic passages 9:1-6, 11:1-8. Yet there is a transformation of this nationalistic emphasis into the ethical sphere, and this marks the great advance of Isaiah over Amos and Hosea. Sellin's conclusions are, therefore, that the expectation of a Messiah was already in existence in Isaiah's day, and that the latter made use of it, giving it a loftier meaning through an ethical emphasis.[1]

Another view of the early origin of the Messianic hope is that which finds it derived psychologically out of the national aspirations and growing consciousness of strength which characterized the Hebrews before the division of the monarchy.[2] It is related both to the view of

---

1. Der A. T. Prophetismus Pp. 78, 172, 186ff.

2. Knudson. The Religious Teachings of the Old Testament. P. 365.

Gressmann, and that of Oesterley. It was Israel's growing national aspirations according to Gressmann, which led her to take over for herself from the outside the idea of an ideal eschatological king. Oesterley, on the other hand, finds the hope of psychological origin, but a heritage which Israel received from her primitive ancestors.

Various psychological derivations have been suggested. Lods, for example, declares emphatically that the hope was earlier than the eighth century.

> The hope of the restoration of Israel, the germ of Messianic hope, was certainly not the creation of the great prophets of the eighth century, but a living product of the old national religion, and which,in so far as it was admitted into the prophetic religion, long remained an alien element there.[1]

By way of explanation as to what part of the national religion furnished this basis for the hope, Lods accepts Mowinckel's view that it was the festival of the enthronement of Yahweh as king. Of the festival, Mowinckel says:

> Israel's Messianic hope is a purely national product: it is the projection into the more remote future of the glorious accession of Yahweh, the renewal of which, from the earliest times of the monarchy was eagerly awaited at the beginning of each new year, and which was celebrated by the feast of Yahweh's enthronement, with the cry. "Yahweh reigns," either in person, or as embodies in his anointed, and the human king.[2]

Hans Schmidt thinks the idea of the Messiah is merely the thought of "a revived David or mythical paradise king." The idea arose simply because his subjects could not believe such a great king as David could die forever. Schmidt compares the idea to similar beliefs held in regard to

---

1. Israel P. 473f.

2. Psalmenstudien Vol. 2. P. 506f.

Nero, Alexander, Charlemagne, and Frederick Barbarossa.[1]

Knudson's view of the origin of the Messianic hope merits consideration as an appraisal of the above mentioned views. He claims that the pre-exilic prophets shared to a certain extent the popular conception of the Messianic hope, though they gave an entirely new ethical content to it. According to popular belief there will be a glorious new day, not for Israel alone, but for the entire world, and not until Israel, along with the other nations, has been visited by a terrible divine judgment.

> This hope in a primitive form is one that we should expect to arise among different peoples. It has its manifest psychological roots. It grows out of the native discontent of the human mind with existing conditions and out of the natural tendency of men to idealize what is distant in time. It was in this way that the widespread belief in a golden age of the past arose, and the corresponding view of the future would naturally originate in the same manner. There is no need to suppose that all expectations of a glorious future emanated from one source. They may have arisen independently in different lands, and then, as they developed, have to some extent influenced each other. In this way the Messianic hope of the Israelites may have received various accretions from parallel developments in Egypt, Babylonia, and other countries. But what was thus borrowed was not the hope itself. The invincible optimism that lay back of Israel's Messianism could not have been borrowed. it was a native growth.[2]

We have, then, four different theories that the Messianic hope existed previous to Isaiah's day, each having a different explanation of its origin. These may be summarized as follows: (1) The Messianic hope originated outside of Israel as a part of an eschatological mythology. It was taken over by Israel from an outside source, probably the

---

1. Der Mythos vom wiederkehrenden König.

2. Knudson, Religious Teaching of the Old Testament. P. 357.

Canaanites who had previously taken it over from Egypt. (2) The Messianic hope is the result of a mythology developing within Israel itself apart from outside influence. (3) The Messianic hope is an outgrowth of Israel's experience at Sinai. (4) The Messianic hope is a psychological product of Israel's developing national life. None of these theories, however, seems to be an adequate solution of the origin of the idea.

It is hardly conceivable that Isaiah would have taken over the idea from mythology, as the first view claims, without assimilating it more to his own thinking. His doctrine of the Day of Yahweh and the remnant were taken over from the popular eschatology, but set in direct opposition to the popular belief.[1] Why should he not have done the same with the Messianic idea? It is also inconceivable that Isaiah would have used the idea, as Gressmann says he did,[2] without understanding its real meaning. If on the other hand, he did make the idea part of his own thought, we still have to explain what led him to use the idea, and what relationship his expression of it held to the traditional belief.

This latter problem also faces us if we accept the second theory. Undoubtedly there was a well developed eschatology of hope in Israel in the eighth century. Amos' protest against the popular conception of the Day of Yahweh is proof of this.[3] This hope, however, was lacking in ethical content, and it rested upon the thought of the direct intervention of Yahweh. The Messianic picture is of a new day brought about by a

---

1. Fullerton. Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah. JBL. Vol. 41, P.97

2. DerMessias. P. 246.

3. Amos 5:18.

righteous king upon whom the Spirit of Yahweh rests. When and why did the conception of such a king arise? To say that the Messianic hope was the result of a mythology developing within Israel itself leaves this question still unanswered.

The third theory answers this question by saying that the idea of a Messianic king arose in the time of Isaiah, when he brought together two existing ideas; the thought that Israel could hope in Yahweh because of the experience at Sinai, and the popular conception of the return of paradise king. On the face of it this does seem a possible solution of the problem, but as we examine it more closely a question arises. On what basis does Sellin reject Gressmann's mythological origin of the hope on the ground that the prophets would not have made such extensive use of mythology while at the same time he retains the idea that Isaiah did make use of a paradise king myth? If the prophet accepted one part of his idea from mythology, why should he not have taken the other part from the same source? Or if we must find an historical experience as a background for the hope itself, why should we not find an historical experience that gave rise to the conception of the Messiah? Apparently Sellin attempts to justify his inconsistency by saying that Isaiah gave the paradise king ethical attributes. This, however, links Isaiah's Messiah definitely with the mythological paradise king, and we are left to discover for ourselves from what field of extra-Biblical material this character comes.

The fourth theory makes no attempt to find the precise time or historical situation in Israel when the growing optimism for the future was crystallized into the Messianic hope. Under this theory any one of

of a number of different dates might be accepted. The definite formulation of the hope might have come as a result of the idealization of the reign of David, the teachings of the prophets, a longing for the reestablishment of the Davidic dynasty after its downfall or any one of a number of historical events, either before or after the exile, that brought hope to an oppressed people.

The above discussion brings up the question of whether or not the Messianic hope existed previous to Isaiah's time. Various Old Testament passages, generally regarded as older than Isaiah, have been considered to predict the coming of the Messiah. Some of these have obviously had the Messianic idea read back into them. Such, for example, is the Messianic interpretation of Genesis 3:5. There is nothing more here than a statement that man will be in perpetual conflict with the forces of evil.

In the Pentateuch are a number of passages which have been regarded by some as Messianic. The first group to be considered are the so-called "blessing" passages, which read, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed," Genesis 12;3, 18:18, 22:18, 26:4, 28:14. It can be seen at once that there is no reference in this phrase to an individual, and so it cannot be regarded as Messianic in our sense of the term. However, we do not need to stop here. The verb stem used in the phrase is in three cases niphal and in two the hithpael. Both of these stems are used to denote reflexive action,[1] and the true meaning of the phrase is brought out when we translate it as reflexive, "In

---

1. Davidson. Hebrew Grammar Pp. 90,93.

thee shall all the nations of the earth bless themselves." The meaning then is that Israel is to be so prosperous that other nations aspiring to greatness will say, "May we be as great as Israel."

Another reference which has been considered Messianic is Genesis 45:7[1] in which Joseph says, "God sent me before you to constitute for you a remnant in the earth that you may be a great company to escape." The underlying idea of this verse, however, is the doctrine of the remnant. There are no grounds for regarding this as Messianic.

There are two passages from the J. document which seem to predict the coming of a Messiah, and for that reason they require careful consideration. The first of these is found in Jacob's blessing upon Judah, Genesis 49:10. It reads, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the inscribed object from between his feet until he come שִׁילֹה, and to him (shall be) the obedience of the people." The verse is corrupt, and the real meaning of שִׁילֹה is enigmatic. Skinner says that מְחֹקֵק might be used personally (prescriber of laws) but it is in parallelism with שֵׁבֶט which is never so used and must be interpreted to mean commander's staff. The picture, then, is of a chieftain with the wand of his office upright before him. He accepts the first part of the verse as referring to kingly authority, and the second half as saying that this authority shall endure until something happens to inaugurate a more glorious future.[2]

The greatest difficulty of the verse is in the word, שִׁילֹה. Retaining this word in the verse, three translations have been given:

---

1. E document.

2. Gen. ICC P. 523.

(1) until Shiloh come, (2) until he (Judah) come to Shiloh, (3) as long as one comes to Shiloh. Many ancient manuscripts have שֶׁלּוֹ in place of this word, making possible the translation, 'whose it is.' This, too, allows for three translations: (1)until he come to that which is his, (2) until that which is his shall come, (3) until he come whose it is.[1]

This verse is regarded by many as an interpolation,[2] but even if we regard the verse as authentic to the J document the indefiniteness of its contents together with the uncertainty of the text hardly merits its being considered Messianic. Nowhere is the Messiah called, Shiloh, except in a passage in the Talmud which takes its authority for so doing from this very verse. If we accept the reading, שִׁילֹה , the most that we are justified in deriving from the verse is that the sceptre will not depart from Judah until someone comes who merits it, and to whom the people will be obedient. What we have, then, is nothing more than a prediction that kingly authority will reside in the tribe of Judah, and that some day a king will come who will claim the authority. Skinner is undoubtedly right in regarding the verse as a reference to the Davidic dynasty, a vaticinum ex eventu, like all the other oracles of the chapter.

The second of the J references, Numbers 24:17, is in the Balaam oracles. It reads, "I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not near: a star will shine forth out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall strike through all the corners of Moab, and destroy all the sons of Sheth." The reference to a star seems to refer to an

---

1. For a discussion of these various readings see ICC on Gen. P. 522ff.

2. Welhausen, Stade, Driver, Holzinger and others.

(1)

individual. From the fact that Bar Kozibah was given the title, Bar-kokba (son of the star) in the time of Hadrian we know that the passage was regarded as Messianic as early as that date. That does not prove, however, that it was originally Messianic. It may be a vaticinum ex eventu from David's conquest of Moab (Cf. II Samuel 8:2), or might equally well be written of any of Omri's exploits.[1]

One thing noticeable about the verse is its vindictiveness. In spirit it is far inferior to the Messianic figure of Isaiah 9:1-6 and 11:1-9. As in the case of Genesis 49:10, the most that we are justified in saying of this passage is that it is a reference to the Davidic dynasty.

The conclusion reached in regard to these two passages from J may also be held in regard to II Samuel 7:14-16. Briggs finds in this passage nothing more than a reference to the House of David, and calls attention to the fact that the Chronicler, in order to give it Messianic significance, was forced to alter the wording of the whole verse.[2] What we have here, then, is merely a prediction of the greatness and perpetuity of the House of David.

If the Messianic idea had existed previous to Isaiah's time, we might expect some reference to it in Amos or Hosea, the two literary prophets who are generally regarded as being predecessors of Isaiah. Volz quotes Wellhausen as saying, "Amos would have protested against the Messianic belief if he had known it."[3] Amos has little if any

---

1. Gray in ICC on Numbers holds this view.
2. Samuel. ICC. P. 128.
3. Die Jahweprophetie. P. 22.

hope for the future, and no reference to the Messiah. In Hosea there is one verse, 3:5, that must be considered. "Afterwards the children of Israel will turn and seek Yahweh their God and David their king, and shall tremble because of Yahweh and because of his goodness in the latter days." This verse was regarded as referring to the Messiah by the Targum and Ebn Ezra. Volz regards the verse as an interpolation.[1] Sellin keeps the verse, but deletes, "and David, their king." Harper argues that the verse is a reference to the Messiah and not to the dynasty,[2] but Cheyne has more in support of his theory that the reference is to the House of David, and reflects Hosea's antagonism to the usurping dynasty.[3] Whether we regard the verse as authentic or not the fact remains that the action here is taken by the children of Israel. There is nothing in the verse that bespeaks the work of the Messiah bringing about the New Age.

We may conclude that there is no scriptural foundation for believing that the idea of a glorious future brought about by the Messiah was in existence before Isaiah's day. There did exist, however, a belief in the greatness and perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty.

1.Ibid P. 31

2.ICC. Hosea. P. 223.

3.Cambridge Bible. Hosea. P. 61f.

CHAPTER III ISAIAH AS THE AUTHOR OF THE MESSIANIC HOPE

Inasmuch as the clearest expression of the Messianic hope is to be found in the book of Isaiah, it is not strange that a number of scholars have looked upon Isaiah himself as the author of this idea. This belief prevailed in the early days of critical research. This was the view presented by Wellhausen who thought the hope would naturally have arisen in the eighth century. It was attached to the monarchy. Wellhausen considered it logical, therefore, to think of the hope as having arisen while the monarchy was in existence. He found the origin of the hope in Isaiah's theology. The prophet emphasized the ethical character of Yahweh. Such an ethical God could not tolerate Israel's sin, but beyond the punishment that Yahweh would send lay hope. This was to come through the work of the Messianic King.

Wellhausen laid stress upon the ethical and historical elements in the Messianic figure. He insisted on continuity between the present and the future, i.e. the future must be a logical and natural outgrowth of the present. The paradise picture of 11:6ff is in his mind poetry and rheteric. The Spirit which rests upon the Messiah in 11:1ff is no different in kind from that which rested upon all ancient worthies. The difference is to be found in the "completeness and permanence" of this bestowal. Isaiah is not painting dream pictures, but is setting up an ideal which is perfectly attainable. The Messiah is to be a strong and just king of David's line, and nothing is attributed to him which passes beyond the range of possibility under the conditions

existing in Judah at the time."

In close agreement with Wellhausen's view are those of Smend and Robertson Smith. Neither of these men finds the Messianic hope an integral part of Isaiah's thinking, but rather an idea that served a specific need, and thus was of temporary nature. Smend contends that the idea of the Messianic king being a descendent of Jesse shows that the expectation of his coming had its origin in the nationalistic feeling of the prophet.[1] Previously, when he gave his prophecies of doom, Isaiah had not held this nationalistic feeling. This feeling arose in the prophet as a result of the pressure of Assyrian domination and the misfortunes which overtook Israel in 734 B. C.

Robertson Smith believes the idea of the Messianic king originated in the Syro-Ephraimitic period as an antithesis to the wicked Ahaz. It was held by the prophet as late as the Sargon period of Hezekiah's reign. In his early years this king was not so good as he has been pictured. He repented, however, at the time of Sennacherib's invasion. There was then no longer need of a Messiah, since in Robertson Smith's thought the Messiah is so much a human being that the rule of a good king makes him superfluous. He says:

> We are apt to think of the days of the Messiah as an altogether new and miraculous dispensation. That was not Isaiah's view. The restoration of Jerusalem is a return to an old state of things, interrupted by national sin.[2]

What Isaiah expects, therefore, is not a new creation, but a reformation within Israel itself. By this reformation Israel will become a holy

---

1. Lehrbuch der alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte. P. 232.

2. The Prophets of Israel. P. 303

state consistent with her position as the chosen people of a holy God. This will be brought about just as all other changes are brought about, i.e. by God's guiding care of the nation. The only difference between the new and the old is that the land will be full of a knowledge of Yahweh and the people will enjoy the peace and happiness which in all ages, past as well as future, have accompanied obedience to Yahweh's laws.

Guthe also finds Isaiah's Messianic idea to be the outgrowth of the political situation at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic war. The situation was so bad in 735 B. C. that Isaiah was unable to hope for deliverance except through the Messiah. Judah was so evil that Isaiah believed the destruction of the land by Assyria essential. After this destruction, the New Sprout from the cut down trunk of Jesse would rule in righteousness over the righteous remnant.[1]

According to Guthe, however, there are two periods to Isaiah's conception of the Messianic age. The change came in the prophet's theught with the improvement of conditions under King Hezekiah.[2] Jerusalem then became identified with the remnant. So, when Assyria threatened, Isaiah expected not a miraculous, but an historical development. Thus in this second period Isaiah held no idea of an individual Messiah. The rescue and final security would be brought about by Yahweh, himself. The new era would begin not with the destruction of Jerusalem, but with

---

1. Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaja P. 12ff.

2. Contrary to Robertson Smith, Guthe believes that Hezekiah was always good.

its escape from destruction.

Guthe is followed in his exegesis by Giesebrecht and Procksch, Giesebrecht[1] goes further than Guthe, though, and finds three stages instead of two in Isaiah's Messianic concept. There are two parts to Guthe's second period. Immediately after the fall of Samaria Isaiah had high hopes for the future of Judah, but his hopes were not too high at the time of Sennacherib's invasion. His loss of hope was due to the alliance with Egypt which was persistently maintained in spite of the prophet's protests. Isaiah then abandoned his belief in the salvation of the nation in favor of a belief in salvation merely of the righteous remnant.

Procksch[2] lays emphasis upon the fact that the Messianic idea is essentially nationalistic. Such is the prophet's conception at the beginning of his career. It was only when Isaiah's great doctrine of faith had been given time to develop, that it gave way to the non-nationalistic emphasis upon the remnant. Thus the change in the prophet's mind came not out of history, but out of the development of his own thought.

In contrast to the Wellhausen view is that of Duhm, who lays stress upon the eschatological character of the Messiahship as expected by Isaiah. Yahweh would use Assyria to punish Judah severely but then He will intervene on her behalf by destroying Assyria. Thus the future will be something entirely new, and in no sense an idealizing of the past.[3] Isaiah did have an ethical interest, but this is to be

---

1. Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik P. 76ff.

2. Geschichtsbetrachtung. P. 38ff.

3. Theologie P. 167.

found in his message of doom. The prophet's originality is to be found in his promises of hope. Isaiah, according to Duhm, is the creator of eschatology.[1] There is, however, much eschatology in the book which is not from Isaiah, for the original prophecies have been set in a great eschatological framework. The problem is how to separate one from the other. Duhm trusts largely to style. He rejects passages that are slovenly written, and follows the rather unsound reasoning that since slovenly written passages are unauthentic, therefore, those well written are authentic.

In his commentary on Isaiah Duhm claimed that the book of Isaiah included passages dating from the time of the prophet to that of the Hasmoneans. Each section, he maintained, should be studied by itself with no regard to what precedes or follows. Chapter 1:21-26 belonged to the prophet's youth. He separated the poem in 9:1-6 from the Syro-Ephraimitic prophecy, and argued that it belonged to the time of the Sennacherib campaign. The three oracles 11:1ff, 32:1ff and 2:2-4, were given by Isaiah at a time near the end of his life. None of these passages except 1:21-26 was made public by Isaiah. They were given to his disciples only. Duhm argued that the Immanuel passage had no Messianic significance, and the Immanuel of 8:8,10 is disposed of by textual criticism.

Isaiah's Messianic prophecy is fundamentally out of touch with his great sermons of doom. This is due to a different interest: the doom prophecies come from the ethical interests of the prophet; the Messianic from his religious interest. The Messianic passages 9:1-6

---

1. See remarks on 1:17 and in ed. 3 on 18:4.

11:1-8, 2:2-4 are poetry originally written, not spoken, not for the general public but for the poet himself and his followers. For them he claimed no divine authority.

> Though directly attached to the immediately prophetic discourses, to those, namely, which are concerned with the present people and present conditions, the discussions, more expecially the future glory, appear to be quite independent of them Through the omission of the formula, 'Thus saith the Lord,' these permit us to see that the prophet speaks more on his own authority and for his own benefit, and does not intend to give his free expressions the authority which belongs to the word of Yahweh. It is important to observe that the predictions of Isaiah are his own private affairs and have no divine authority for others.[1]

Duhm is of the opinion that Isaiah's figure of the Davidic Messiah does not come from his interest in the political affairs of Judah, but out of his own thought, character and experience. He suggests that the prophet's nearness to the court and his respect for the royal prerogatives as seen in the Shebna prophecy may account in part for the rise of Isaiah's hope in a descendent of David.[2] However, he does not develop this idea. He seems content to accept the Messianic doctrine as a product of the prophet's own thought life, which as such, needs no further explanation.

Welch is not sure whether Isaiah created the Messianic idea or took over an existing idea and remade it as Amos did the idea of the Day of Yahweh. At any rate if he did use an existing idea, he adapted it so definitely to a specific situation that it practically became a new thought. The Messianic hope was for Isaiah a part of his conception of the divine nature. Yahweh, for an ethical reason, and with

---

1. Theologie P. 158.

2. Israel's Propheten P. 186.

a redemptive purpose, is about to intervene in world affairs. All that Isaiah had to say is colored by his own experience of redemption in conjunction with his call by Yahweh.

> The prophet saw that what stood in the way of the higher things he hoped for his people was not merely Ahaz as an individual, or the court which Ahaz had gathered round him; it was the whole conception of all for which Judah stood in the world, which embodied itself in the attitude and temper of its rulers. The worldly kingdom with its worldly aims was perverting Judah, so that the nation could neither see nor welcome Yahweh's purpose with them and through them. Therefore, the kingdom, with all it represented, must pass away. The deliverer could not come to Judah as Judah was. Only after Judah had learned through sore discipline which has humbled men's pride, can the great future dawn. The new scion shall spring only from the stump of Jesse (11:1). The old kingdom must go to make room for the new thing which Yahweh is bringing to pass.[1]

His use of the idea makes Isaiah "emphatically a prophet of hope." To say he had no hope makes it impossible to explain his visit to Ahaz with Shear-yashub.

> Both the explanation and the origin of the name are to be found in the fundamental truth of Isaiah's own religious life and of his prophetic commission. He knew himself to be in a right relation to God, because he had received the divine forgiveness; he was conscious that he had something to say to his nation as to Yahweh's purpose with it, because his own commission rested on the divine mercy. No man who holds this truth as the source of his religious life and his religious work can be a mere prophet of denunciation.[2]

The purpose of Isaiah's interview with Ahaz is to show the King that Yahweh is behind the forces of the world and controls them all. Ahaz is not a weakling as he is so often pictured. By his appeal to Assyria he is not inviting the latter to come into the west for she is already there. So the guilt of the King is not to be found in his trafficing with Assyria, but in his refusal to accept the prophet's

---

1. The Religion of Israel Under the Kingdom. P. 181.

2. Ibid. P. 155.

philosophy of history.

Since Isaiah holds that Yahweh is free and self-revealing, he could not go out with one specific message which could be summed up in so many words."[1] So a change took place in the prophet's thinking. His hope at first was for the whole nation of Judah, but later was limited to the remnant that would trust Yahweh.

In Yahweh's intervention the House of David will be completely overthrown. This is made necessary by the opposition of the royal court to Yahweh's supreme purpose. Just as the Northern Kingdom had been doomed by the course she had taken, so would it be with Judah. What threatened Judah was not the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition, but the opposition to the rule of Yahweh in the land. Neither Rezin, nor Pekah, nor even Tiglath-pilezer were the governors of history but Yahweh. Later, however, after Ahaz had died, and ambassadors came from Philistia to ask the court of Jerusalem to join the league for freedom, Isaiah gave expression to the doctrine of the inviolatibility of Jerusalem.

The Messianic passages in chapter 9:1-6 and 11:1-9 were given to Isaiah's disciples. In 11:1ff we have more than poetry. It is an expression of Isaiah's recognition of how much the world needed renewal. The Messianic king will represent all that Yahweh intended the nation to be when he called it into being. The Spirit which decends upon the Messiah is Yahweh Himself. Welch maintains that the Old Testament holds no clear doctrine by which the Spirit of Yahweh can be distinguished from Yahweh Himself. What Isaiah expected was a new kingdom to be set up

---

1. Ibid. P. 149.

by Yahweh coming down to earth.

Welch calls attention to the fact that the passages of hope are scattered through the prophecy and argues that if these were glosses they would not be so scattered but would appear at the end of the prophecy as they do in Amos and Hosea. Moreovèr, he feels that such a hope-prophecy as that of Second Isaiah would never have been added to Isaiah if the prophet had been known primarily as a predictor of doom. Why, if he was known in his own day as a prophet of doom, was he, thus celebrated in exile a century or a century and a half later as an exponent of the opposite view? Jeremiah remembered that Micah had said Jerusalem would be ploughed as a field.[1] If Isaiah had preached only doom why did not later prophets refer to him as well in support of their message?

Miss Louise Smith confined her study in this field to the Messianic ideal of Isaiah ben Amoz.[2] She approached this topic by separating the Messianic from the eschatological prophecies thus limiting her study to four passages:[3] 1:24-27, 9:1-6, 10:33-11:10, 32:1-6, which "agree in describing a political kingdom with a definite government distinct from Yahweh Himself." In these passages we have the "earliest definite formulation of a Messianic expectation." Her criticism for the genuineness of these passages is their consistency with the historical conditions of the time and the other prophecies known to be authentic.

---

1. Jeremiah 26:18

2. "The Messianic Ideal of Isaiah." JBL. Vol. 36 Pp. 158ff.

3. The passages which she find purely eschatological are 2:2-4, 4:2-6, 11:11-12:5, 17:12-24, 24-27, 28:5-6, 29:17-24, 30:18-30, 32:15-20, 33:13-24, 35.

The oracle in 1:24-27 is the earliest of the four prophecies, being given probably sometime during the blockade of Sennacherib before the Assyrian army had retired. Though this passage is not strictly Messianic, it may be considered such because it gives no history of a rule by Yahweh Himself. The most elaborate and definitely Messianic is 10:33-11:10. The acceptance of 10:33-34 and 11:10 with the generally accepted 11:1-9 is held essential to the integrity of the poem. The paradise picture 11:6-8, though of an apocalyptic temper, is shown to be paralleled in an old Sumerian myth[1] and need not therefore be regarded as a late apocalyptic picture. Both 10:33-11:10 and 9:1-6 are found to be poems that are "homogeneous and symetrically whole." The first falls naturally into six strophes of three couplets each, while the second may be divided into four strophes of three couplets each. In neither poem does the language or the ideas argue against Isaianic authorship. Miss Smith is not too sure of the genuineness of the fourth passage. Verses 6-8 are so similar to late wisdom literature that they are obviously non-Isaianic and, verses 1-5, she admits are doubtful, though the denial of this passage to Isaiah in no way effects her general views.

It is absurd to think that since Isaiah was a prophet of doom he could not also have had a message of hope. We are not to think that the prophets spoke with the precision of the mathematical formula X-X=0 Isaiah could never have continued so long in the prophetic office had he been only a preacher of doom. The prophet's Messianic idea is a result

---

1. See Exhibit C

of his faith in Yahweh being justified by the events of history. His Immanuel message to Ahaz was as much a threat as a promise. At first the doctrine of a remnant signified destruction. Only an insignificant portion would escape, but when the Assyrian army was actually approaching then Isaiah had real comfort in the thought that after all some part of the nation would escape. He then proclaimed the doctrine of the remnant with a new significance.

That Isaiah received his idea of the Messianic king from history and not from mythology is supported by the epithets given to the king in 9:1-6.[1] Miss Smith contends that the proper translation of אֲבִי עַד is "Father of Booty," and that the term אֵל גִּבּוֹר, mighty as God, does not necessarily imply divinity. Isaiah has no room in his thought for a supernatural monarch. It is not fair to insist that Isaiah's ideal king is a mythological figure merely because certain accompaniments of his reign are described in terms drawn from mythology. What he longs for is a restoration of the days of David and Solomon as he knew them. The J and E sections of the book of Samuel and Kings which had received nearly their present form in Isaiah's time "bear witness that the reigns of Saul, David and especially Solomon were then being idealized and thought of in terms of world empire of Assyria."[2] Isaiah, as a poet, merely took these ideals of his people and clothed them in new words.

The particular historical situation which Miss Smith finds bringing forth the full Messianic doctrine is that which immediately followed

---

1. The Messianic Idea of Isaiah JBL. Vol. 36 P. 204.

2. Ibid P. 198.

the deliverance of Jerusalem from the invasion of Sennacherib. Although the story of Jerusalem's escape recorded in Isaiah 36-37 cannot be trusted for accuracy, it must have had its origin in an actual event. Otherwise it is hard to account for the idea that the city did escape destruction as well as for Isaiah's great reputation. If Isaiah had prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem and it had not taken place later generations would have hesitated to ascribe to him so much that he did no write.

Miss Smith thinks that immediately following the deliverance of Jerusalem a change took place in the character of King Hezekiah. He had previously been weak and vacillating, easily influenced for evil as well as good. He was far from being an ideal king.[1] With the deliverance of Jerusalem, however, he turned in faith to Yahweh and conducted his reforms. It is at this point that we may look for the rise of the Messianic doctrine.

> It is during this time that the expectation of the reign of an ideal king might easily develop. Yahweh had shown His ability to protect Zion by His direct intervention, and the whole people, with the remembrance of their deliverance fresh in their minds, were eagerly serving Yahweh alone, as their king demanded. Surely it would be natural to hope that Yahweh would soon raise up among Hezekiah's successors a king who should enable them wholly to free themselves from the Assyrian supremacy, and would regain for the chosen people the glory of the reign of Solomon.[2]

Like Miss Smith, Whitehouse finds Isaiah's Messianic hope a result of deliverance of Jerusalem from destruction. It was this event which caused the prophet to begin to hope.[3] All the Messianic passages in

---

1. JBL. Vol. 35 P. 181.

2. Ibid P. 187

3. New Century Bible Commentary P. 61.

Isaiah 1-39 are genuine. The oracle in 9:1-6 was the first uttered, and that in 2:2-4 the last. The first oracle is the echo of another spoken previously by the prophet and recorded in 30:27-35. Throughout all the Messianic oracles there is but one recurring theme, first uttered by Amos, that the diseased state can be saved by righteousness alone.

Whitehouse believes that the word, סְאוֹן, "boot" in 9:4 is not an Aramaic word which may be used to argue for a post-exilic date for this oracle. It is rather a loan word, imported in the time of Isaiah from Assyria. The word, אֲבִי עַד, however is enigmatic.

There is no real analogy between 9:1-7 and the Messianic idea as expressed in Zerubbabel. We might connect the two if we had only the Zerubbabel reference of Haggai 2:21-23, but Zechariah 4:6 and 6:12 dispels the illusion for there Zerubbabel is the leader of a church nation.

Skinner finds no sufficient reason to doubt the genuineness of the Messianic oracles in Isaiah 1-39, though he admits that the Isaianic authorship cannot be proved.[1] The fact that there is no reference to these oracles in Jeremiah, Ezekiel nor Second Isaiah is no proof that Isaiah did not write them for none of these prophets refer to the doctrine of the remnant which is universally recognized as one of Isaiah's principle teachings.

The Messiah, according to Skinner, is in some sense a divine figure. This is suggested by the names of 9:5, which seem to link this oracle with the Immanuel passage. In both the destiny of the nation is

---

1. Isa. Cambridge Bible.P. 69.

made to turn upon the birth of a child. It may be, however, that these names signify nothing more "than that the Messiah was God's gift to the nation in the crisis of its destiny, and a pledge that the whole power of God would be put forth for the establishment of His Kingdom."[1]

The dating of the oracles is left unsettled by Skinner. The prevailing view among early critics that 9:2-7, 11:1-9, and 32:1-5 belonged in the order given was due to the fact that they belong to the discourses in which they occur. No proof of this can be found, and the oracles as a whole must go undated.

Some scholars who hold to the authenticity of the Messianic oracles in Isaiah 1-39 admit the existence of some kind of a Messianic hope before Isaiah's day. They look upon Isaiah, however, as the one who first gave real definitness to this thought, and so regard him as virtually the creator of the hope. We have already cited Kittel as saying that "Isaiah is in a special sense the creator of the Messianic idea." However, Kittel goes on to say:

> But he only reaped where his predecessors had sown. The Jahwist whose work we have assigned somewhere about the time of Elijah, has recorded an ancient tradition, (Genesis 3:15) which proves that the evolution of the Messianic idea had been going on prior to Isaiah's day.[2]

Even if we regarded the oracles of chapters 9 and 11 from a century later than Isaiah's time, Kittel maintains we would still find the Messianic hope in the genuine sections of the prophecy. He finds the child of 7:14 essentially the Messiah. The idea of a wonderful Redeemer-Child

---

1. Op. Cit. P. lxvi.

2. Scientific Study of the Old Testament. P. 248.

is not original with the prophet. Nor is the proto-type to be found in Babylonia or Egypt, for in neither of these lands, according to Kittel was there to be found the idea of "a future royal son of God who would establish a reign of blessedness and peace."[1] The Immanuel idea is borrowed by the prophet from the Hellenistic mystery religions, the influence of which is also seen in his Messianic oracles.[2]

Isaiah's conception of the Messiah is the natural conclusion of his religious belief. The prophet believed that Yahweh had chosen Israel, 5:1ff. Therefore he did not believe Yahweh would permit her to be destroyed (28:16).[3] Israel must be reformed. A new generation must replace the old. This new generation, morally pure and possessing a knowledge of the attributes of God, will need a leader after God's own heart to lead them toward the consumation of their great task. Such a leader will be the Messiah upon whom the Spirit of Yahweh will rest.[4]

In addition to Kittel there are two others whose theories we must consider at this point. Peters claims that while it is Isaiah who gives us the first undisputable evidence of the Messianic hope, the foundations of this hope are laid in the most ancient period of Hebrew history.[5]

---

1. Religion of the People of Israel. P. 114.

2. Die hellenistische Mysterien-religion und das Alte Testament. P. 6f.

3. Cf. the view of Oesterley and Robinson, Hebrew Religion. P. 209. It is with Isaiah that we find the beginning of that conception which later ripened into a full Messianic doctrine, and we shall not greatly err if we trace it back to the prophet's conception of the mutual holiness of Yahweh and Israel.

4. Scientific Study of the Old Testament. P. 238.

5. The Religion of the Hebrews. P. 425.

In the earliest writings we find a record of a peculiar relationship of Yahweh to Israel and Israel to Yahweh. This is an intensification of a belief common to Semitic people, which holds that not only the honor but the very existence of the tribal god is bound up with his people. This idea found peculiar emphasis, however, among the Israelites. Out of it at a time of national catastrophe, Isaiah received his Messianic hope.

Because Israelite dominion had culminated in David, the Messianic hope was linked up with this king. So the ideal king will be a scion of Jesse's stock upon whom will rest the Spirit of God. He will rule in righteousness. He will neither engage in wars of conquest nor aspire to political greatness, but will be a beacon to lead other nations to God. Peters calls our attention to the fact that quite unlike this, Haggai and Zechariah see in Zerubbabel one whose chief work is to rebuild the temple and rule Israel.[1]

Wade, also, believes that the idea of the coming of a wonderful king was current in Israel before Isaiah's day, but that it was Isaiah who gave it definite formulation.[2] Unlike most commentators, Wade holds to the Messianic interpretation of 7:14-16. This and the oracle in 9:1-6 are the most important of Isaiah's four Messianic oracles. The other two are 11:1-9 and 32:1-8. The importance of the first two oracles lies in the fact that the names applied to the wonderful child suggest superhuman personality, though the distinction between superhuman and human was not felt by Isaiah and his contemporaries as it is felt today. Men of extra-ordinary ability were held to partake of the character of God.

---

1. Ibid P. 432.

2. Book of the Prophet Isaiah.

Isaiah expected the advent of the Messiah to take place at the close of the Assyrian crisis. The magnitude of this crisis was so great that the prophet believed it must be followed by an era of happiness that would be just as momentous. Thus the purpose of the Messiah would not be to deliver from Assyria, but to guard against a recurrence of the disorders that had brought hardship upon the people. The prophet did not think it necessary to tell how the Messiah was related to the reigning monarch.

The Immanual oracle was delivered at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic war. An attempt has been made by the editors of the book of Isaiah to link 9:1-6 with this period also by prefixing 8:23 to the oracle. The date of this latter oracle is better fixed at ca. 701, when the Assyrians were attacking Jerusalem. A little later, when the Assyrians had completely withdrawn, Isaiah delivered 11:1-9. The Messianic figure in this oracle closely resembles the one in 9:1-6. Wade does not believe that this oracle can rightly be called post-exilic on the basis of verse 1.[1] Neither does he believe that the idea of universal peace extending to the animal kingdom is any more unlikely to have been current in the eighth century than in subsequent time. The last oracle is placed in the prophet's old age, and verses 6-8 are probably an interpolation.

In considering the above theories which regard Isaiah as the author of the Messianic hope, it is noticeable that there is lack of agreement among them as to what period in the prophet's life the oracles are to be placed, and what it was that brought them forth in the prophet's teaching.

---

1. In support of his argument he cites 14:19 and Dan. 9:7, vss. in which the idea of "shoot" is applied to the offshoot of a family.

Some date the oracles arbitrarily without giving any reason for so doing. Others prefer to leave the question open. G. A. Smith, for example, says that it is impossible to ascertain where Isaiah began to prophesy the expectation of a glorious king, or how far this expectation was defined. On the other hand, Miss Louise Smith, who feels that a definite historical situation must be found for the oracles is forced to resort to psychologizing to establish her thesis.

> If then Isaiah saw his faith in Yahweh justified by the departure of Sennacherib, and his desire for the repentance of his people at least partly satisfied in the reforms of Hezekiah, the Messianic prophecies in chapters 9 and 11 form the fitting climax to his ministry. Hezekiah vacillating, easily influenced for evil as well as for good, was far from being an ideal king. Surely Jehovah, who had already done so much for His people would crown His goodness by giving them a king who would lead them to greater glory.[1]

If, then, we are to regard the Isaianic oracles as authentic we must find more definite historical data to support our thesis.

The above theories are also divided as to what it was that gave Isaiah his Messianic hope. Wellhausen and Robertson Smith, for example, find it to be the political situation of the prophet's day. Kittel and Peters, on the other hand find the hope to be an outgrowth of the prophet's religious belief. The lack of agreement at this point leads Fullerton to raise the question, "Is the Messiah a political figure with a dash of religion and morals, or a religious and ethical figure with a dash of politics?"[2] Before we can unreservedly ascribe the creation of the Messianic hope to Isaiah we must be able to show more accurately that the hope

---

1. Op. Cit. P. 191.

2. Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah JBL. Vol 41 P. 37.

would have been a logical part of the prophet's thinking.

We may conclude from this discussion, however, that there are arguments in favor of the authenticity of the Messianic oracles in Isaiah 1-39, which those who deny their authenticity must answer. The latter half of the eighth century was a critical time for both Israel and Judah. During that period Israel ceased forever to be a nation, and Judah was reduced to the position of a subject state. The prophets of that day sought to avert the disaster. They saw doom ahead, to be sure, but who can say that a man of Isaiah's faith would not have seen a new day that would dawn out of the darkness? The following quotation from Ottley may be taken as a true statement of the situation.

> It may reasonably be urged that the figure of the Davidic king was of paramount importance during the struggle with Assyria. In the days of peril and gloom men's thoughts instinctively reverted to the the figure of the shepherd king whose prowess had first raised the nation to greatness, whose devotion to Jehovah had been so conspicuous, and who was believed to have been the recipient of a unique promise - the promise of an everlasting continuance of his house. Such ideal descriptions of the Davidic king as we find in Isaiah 9:1 f are not out of harmony with the historical situation, nor inconsistent with the prophetic manner of pointing to some future blessing as the exact counterpart of present calamity. It is quite conceivable that Isaiah should set over against a weak, unprincipled monarch like Ahaz of Judah the figure of a strong and righteous ruler, recalling the golden days of the early monarchy. We may readily suppose that 'memory equally with the present dearth of personalities, prompted to a great desire, and with passion Israel waited for a man, in whom each age expected the qualities of power and character needed for its own troubles.' Whether therefore the passages in question are really the work of the eighth-century prophets or whether they embody the thoughts and hopes of a later age, at least we may hold that the image of an ideal king was no unlikely product of the age in which they wrote.[1]

---

1. The Religion of Israel. P. 86.

CHAPTER IV. THE MESSIANIC HOPE: A POST-ISAIANIC DEVELOPMENT

The tendency in recent years has been to regard the Messianic hope as a late development. The general opinion of scholars who hold to this view is that the idea could have developed only after the Davidic dynasty had fallen. The following quotation from D. H. Corley may be taken as a typical expression of this view.

> The common feature in all these oracles is the late date at which they were written; it is not natural to imagine that any prophet would stand up to declare that the Almighty would restore the throne of David to the seed of David while David's latest heir was still occupying the throne. After the exile had begun, prophecies of the restoration of the seed of David to the throne were made by Haggai and Zechariah; it is natural to suppose, therefore that these are additions made to the prophecies of Isaiah after 586 B. C.[1]

The late dating of the Messianic prophecies may be considered to have begun with the work of Stade.[2] The "many nations" passages in Isaiah, thought Stade, are more in keeping with the Gog-Magog picture in Ezekiel than with anything in Isaiah. He concluded, therefore, that all Messianic passages in Isaiah are late.

Stade was followed by Hackmann who found absolutely no hope in Isaiah's prophecy.[3] The prophet had only a message of doom. Any promise of hope would have weakened his message. Hackmann is inconsistent, though, for he does admit the genuineness of 1:21-26 without showing how this harmonizes with a prophecy that had no note but that of doom.

---

1. D. H. Corley AJSL. P. 223.
2. Geschichte des Volkes Israel. 1885
3. Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia. 1893.

Going into the question more completely than Stade or Hackmann, Volz argues that:

> The Messianic idea stands too much in opposition to Isaiah's religious and moral ideas, to his faith and his world view, or to the developing elements of the Old Testament religion which Isaiah set forth to remain in the frame of historical consideration.[1]

In two respects, however, Isaiah's prophecy was related to the Messianic idea; in the unique position of Israel, and in its treatment of the political organization for the new time.

Volz finds five Messianic oracles in Isaiah 1-39.[2] These are not genuine, but are additions made to the book from post-exilic literature. It is in exilic and post-exilic literature that we find genuine Messianic predictions. This is due to the fact that prophecy just previous to the exile took a turn in the direction of Messianic prediction.[3] The doctrine of the Messiah originated in connection with the Deuteronomic reforms. This development of the Messianic idea during the exile was a result of pre-exilic prophetic thinking. The idea, however, did not spring forth fully developed. It had previously been cultivated by the uncanonical prophets. The pre-exilic prophets did have some hope for Israel, though, they were essentially prophets of doom. It was the fact of this hope which came to turn in the direction of Messianic prophecy, though the Messianic idea did not find actual expression until the exile had taken place. Nationalism was essentially against the Yahweh faith of the prophets, but prophecy "entered into a bond with nationalism which

---

1. Volz. Jahweprophetie P. 42.

2. 9:1ff, 11:1ff, 28:6, 32:108, 33:17.

3. Ibid. P.81

furnished the most powerful motive for the Messianic hope."[1] If the prophets had preached the doctrine of a Messianic king while there was still a king upon the throne, they would have been accused of trying to start a rebellion.

Marti states emphatically that the Immanuel passage has no Messianic significance, whether direct or indirect. It is merely an expression of Isaiah's doctrine that prosperity is dependent upon faith.[2] When he comes to the two Messianic oracles, 9:1-6 and 11:1-8, he makes an attempt to find a specific post-exilic date for them, but finds it very difficult to do this. The two passages are so similar in content that they stand or fall together.[3] The reference in 16:4b-5 also belongs with these oracles.[4] The oracle in 32:1-5, to which 32:15b-20 also belongs, forms a companion picture to 11:1-8, and comes from the Greek period. It occupies its present position in the book because the compiler wished a picture of hope to follow the denunications contained in chapters 28-31.[5]

Six reasons are found by Marti why the oracle in 9:1-6 must not be accepted as the work of Isaiah.[6] (1) The prophet expressed in

---

1. Die Jahweprephetie. P. 74ff.
2. Jesaja. In Kurzer Hand-Commentar. P. 78f.
3. Ibid P. 113.
4. Ibid. P. 137.
5. Ibid. P. 236f.
6. Ibid. P. 94f.

words that sound like a farewell message his hope in Yahweh and a religious community without political organization (cf. 8:16-18), but not in a Davidic dynasty nor a political ruler. The Messiah of 9:1-6, on the other hand, is a great political figure who has no direct significance for religion. (2) For the pre-exilic prophets Yahweh's zeal was against Israel. It is with Ezekiel that it becomes for the first time a ground for hope. (3) All the people, not only a part, are here suffering misfortune, and are forced to bear the yoke of a foreign taskmaster. (4) The Family of David is still in existence, but no member of it is reigning. Though one may say that Isaiah foresaw the downfall of the Davidic dynasty and the exile, and could have promised an ideal king for that time, such a view fails to recognize what we know to be certain of Isaiah, namely, he did not hope for prosperity for the dynasty, and his last words about the people were, שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב (6:11) and לוֹ־שַׁחַר אֲשֶׁר (8:20). (5) Neither Jeremiah nor Ezekiel nor Deutero-Isaiah knows anything of this promise. (6) The oracle stands at the end of a small collection thus being an example of a compiler's method of following a prediction of doom with one of hope.

In 11:1-8 three additional arguments against Isaianic authorship are found.[1] (1) When Isaiah had anything to do with kings, he laid upon them fixed demands which he hoped they themselves would fulfill. Here, however, everything hinges upon the outpouring of the Spirit. (2) Reference to the Spirit of Yahweh elsewhere is a sign of a late time.

---

1. Jesaja. P. 113

(3) We may question whether the idea of the reconstruction of nature along peaceful lines as seen in 11:6-8, existed in Isaiah's day. The prophet gives no other similar picture.

These two Messianic oracles are to be located, according to Marti, between the time of Zerubbabel and the reading of the Law by Ezra, i.e., between the years 540 and 440. Both Haggai and Zechariah give Messianic significance to Zerubbabel. Zechariah calls him "the branch," taking his thought from Jeremiah 23:5 and 33:15. Since these two prophets hold the Messianic hope and neither of them refers to this hope as expressed in the oracles of Isaiah 1-39, it must follow that these oracles are later than their time. Finding it impossible to date the oracles more definitely, Marti accepts the year, 500, as the approximate time when they were written.[1]

In close agreement with the view of Marti is that of Cheyne. The latter, however, feels that in the Immanuel oracle, 7:10-17, Isaiah is friendly toward Ahaz, and striving to help him. Verses 15, 17 are deleted as glosses, and the passage is not given Messianic significance.[2]

Cheyne also finds six arguments against the authenticity of 9:1-6, though they do not coincide throughout with those of Marti. Cheyne's arguments are as follows: (1) The Messianic glory pictured here is in no definite relationship to any situation in Judah, and "contains no reference to an accompanying moral regeneration of the people." (2) The thought of 'Yahweh as King' so filled the mind of Isaiah that there

---

1. Jesaja. P. 95.

2. Introduction to the Book of Isaiah. P. 34f.

seems to be no room for an earthly king. (3) Isaiah never refers anywhere else to the ideas contained in 9:1-6 and 11:1-8. If he gave these oracles, why does he not refer to them again? (4) No reference is to be found to either of these oracles in Jeremiah or the Second-Isaiah, though both of these prophets knew Isaiah very well. Moreover, Zechariah turns to Jeremiah's prophecy for his doctrine of the צֶמַח . (5) References to traditional stories in other parts of the prophecy, such as the one contained herein of Gideon's defeat of Midian are found to be unauthentic. (6) The ideas in 9:1-6 lack Isaiah's lucidity. These arguments lead Cheyne to assign the oracle to a post-exilic date, though he feels there is not such strong argument for a late date for this passage as there is for 2:2-4, 30:27-33, 32.[1]

The oracle in 11:1-8 is from the same period as that in 9:1-6, but the passage is so isolated from the rest of the prophecy that it is practically impossible to date it with any degree of certainty. The most we can say is that if 8:22-9:6 comes from the period of Ahaz then this probably comes from that period also.[2] Cheyne is of the opinion there are not sufficient grounds for tying these prophecies up with that period. He uses two general arguments against Isaianic authorship. Certain words are considered to be later than the eighth century, but with this argument Cheyne admits that we must proceed cautiously.[3] The ideas expressed are also considered un-Isaianic. The illusiveness of the style of

---

1. Introduction to the Book of Isaiah. P. 45f.

2. Ibid. P. 63.

3. Ibid. P.64.

verse 1 points to a late date. The picture in verses 6-8, while not inconsistent with Isaiah's ideas "implies a brooding over traditional ideas which indicates a more advanced stage of intellectual development."[1] It seems to have come from the period just preceding early apocalyptic writing.

Cheyne finds 15:4b-5 "an ideal sketch of the state of Judah in the Messianic age," but calls it undoubtedly a late insertion.[2] He admits that the language of 22:20-21, with which Isaiah hails the elevation of Eliakim to the position Shebna had held, is almost Messianic in tone. The presence of uncommon words here, however, leads him to state that Duhm is probably right in assigning these verses to a later hand.[3]

The oracle in 32:1-8 is assigned to a date later than the time of Isaiah on the ground "that the points of contact with the actual life of Jerusalem which it presents are only such as imitators could produce."[4] Moreover, the reference to "a king" in verse 1 is colorless. If this is from Isaiah and he had in mind some definite king, Hezekiah, for instance, we might expect a more concrete statement. Cheyne follows Guthe in saying that we may infer from verse 1 that the author lived at a time when political life was extinct, and when men who admired the writings of the great prophets tried to imitate their style.[5]

---

1. Op. Cit. P. 65.
2. Ibid. P. 90.
3. Ibid. P. 137.
4. Ibid. P. 173.
5. Ibid. P. 174.

Futhermore the style of this oracle lacks the spontaneity that characterizes Isaiah's work. Cheyne finds nineteen words here which do not occur in the prophet's acknowledged prophecies, and concludes that it was added by a post-exilic editor to offset the doom prophecies of 28-31.[1]

H. P. Smith thinks it was Ezekiel who gave a definite form to the hope of restoration. The pre-exilic prophets did have a few hopeful features, though for the most part these prophecies took on the character of denunciations. The definite lines with which Ezekiel drew his picture made a deep impression upon the people. It contained the three essential features of what is known from his time on as the Messianic hope: namely, the punishment of the hostile world power, the restoration of the Jews in the homeland, and the dwelling of Yahweh in the midst of the new commonwealth.[2] This, to be sure, is of the Messianic hope in its broader sense. The personal Messiah is not a dominant figure in Ezekiel. The post-exilic Jews could not think the predictions in regard to the Davidic dynasty had been fulfilled. They, therefore, began to look for a personal Messiah.

There is no consistency of thought in the various expressions of the Messianic idea, according to Smith. The idea has its most lofty expression in the person of the Servant of Yahweh of Second Isaiah. Smith does not tell us who this Servant is, though he is inclined to believe that he is the personification of the ideal Israel. In the glorification of the Law that took place in post-exilic Judaism, interest in the Messianic hope died down. It was kindled into flame again during the persecutions

---

1. Op. Cit. P. 175.

2. Religion of Israel. P. 242.

of Antiochus Epiphanes. Then it took on new and fantastic forms and was expressed in the form of apocalypses.

Fullerton agrees with Hackmann and Volz in assigning the Messianic prophecies in Isaiah 1-39 to a date later than the prophet's time on the ground that they are out of keeping with his real message. He says of these oracles:

> When they are examined in the light of Isaiah's other teaching and of his prophetic career, a serious doubt arises whether they originated with him.....They are found to be out of harmony with Isaiah's most characteristic thoughts and deepest convictions and at the same time with the needs of the political and religious situation in his day as he understood it.[1]

Nowhere in Isaiah is the idea of the Messianic king merged with any of the four cardinal teachings of the prophet: i.e. the remnant, the day of the Lord, national repentence and faith.

There are three general objections, according to Fullerton, against thinking of Isaiah as the author of the Messianic hope. The first of these is its nationalistic emphasis. To be sure, the eschatology of hope is early, but this was the eschatology of the so-called false prophets with whom such men as Amos, Hosea and Isaiah took issue. It was the majority point of view, but the eighth century literary prophets were in the minority, always preaching against this point of view. They made no concessions whatever to it. Later literary prophets, however, accepted it. Prophecy in general was many-sided, but the eighth century prophets were one-sided, driving their ethical premises to the limit. Since nationalism was implied in the popular eschatology of hope, and the prophets were opposed to nationalism, they must consequently have been

---

1. JBL. Vol. 41 Pp. 27,72.

opposed to the popular eschatology.[1]

The second objection has to do with the miraculous element in the Messianic oracles. The Messiah is no ordinary individual as may be readily seen. He is endowed with supernatural charisms, and the peace which he will bring is a supernatural peace. All this is in sharp contrast to the intense realism of Isaiah.

The third objection is that the influence of these oracles is not seen in the works of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Fullerton thinks that "this absence of all references to the Messiah for over a hundred years is the strangest sort of fact if the Messianic passages in Isaiah are original.[2]

Fullerton's conclusion is that in the time of Zechariah and Haggai a separation of politics and eschatology took place.

> Those elements in Isaiah, chapters 9 and 11, which have been held to express Isaiah's revolt against nationalism and have therefore served as a basis for the defense of these prophecies, are far more easily explained, not as an antithesis to the nationalism of Isaiah's day, but as the natural expression of the new conception of nationalism in the post-exilic period, in which the nation is no longer, strictly speaking, the nation, but rather a nascent church, and the king is a servant of the Temple.[3]

The reason for these prophecies being linked with the name of Isaiah is found in the high esteem in which he was held at the time of the exile. He was the most outstanding figure of the eighth century. There had been a note of genuine hope in his prophecy. This is to be found in the oracle of 1:21-26, the doctrine of the remnant and the doctrine of faith.

---

1. Op. Cit. P. 101.

2. Ibid. P. 41.

2. Ibid. P. 97.

the exiles identified themselves with the remnant, and so attributed the Messianic oracles to Isaiah. The ease with which they could identify the child of 9:1-6 with Immanuel helped to convince them that the oracles truly belonged to the prophet.

Torrey believes that the Second Isaiah was the author of the specifically Messianic doctrine. His work was written about 400 and was the fountain-head of all the later streams of thought and literary tradition which we designate by the term, the Messianic hope.[1] Before the Second Isaiah's day the Messianic hope was an underlying stratum of prophecy and not a field of thought open to the eyes of the world. It is in Isaiah 45:1ff that for the first time in Hebrew literature the word, Messiah, is applied to the coming one, long promised, whose coming will inaugurate the New Age. The reference here is not to Cyrus. The name, Cyrus, according to Torrey, does not belong in the text. It breaks the metre, and is obviously an interpolation. The reference is rather to God's Messiah who is about to come to usher in the New Age.

A clear setting forth of Second Isaiah's Messianic doctrine is to be found in 66:6-9. The male child who is brought forth (verse 7) is the Messiah (called by the Targum, 'the King'). His birth will bring about the New Age. It is a miraculous birth, with the pains of childbirth, and by it the Messiah and His brethren of the greater family are produced in one brief measure of time.[2]

---

1. "Outcroppings of the Jewish Messianic Hope." In, Case, Studies in Early Christianity. P. 286. The Second Isaiah. P. 470.

2. The Second Isaiah. P. 471f.

Many passages are to be found in Isaiah 1-39 which show dependence upon the Second Isaiah.[1] The Messianic oracles in chapters 9 and 11 belong to this group. In defense of his position Torrey calls attention to the fact that these two passages are generally recognized as the work of a single hand, and that the prevailing opinion of scholars of the present day is that they are late.

The oracles in Isaiah 1-39 are expansions of shorter Messianic predictions in the Second Isaiah rather than vice versa. An example of this is seen in 9:5 which is the result of reflection upon 66:7, and developes in a magnificent way what was there given in brief compass. Likewise 11: 7-9 is an expansion of 65:25.

> Observe how the first part of this verse is repeated in verse 7, and the concluding portion in verse 9, while the intervening mention of 'the serpent' is played upon at some length in verse 8. In the last-mentioned particular there is indisputable evidence that the passage in chapter 11 is the later. There is nothing in 11:8 to suggest even remotely the 'serpent' of Genesis 3:14 and the diet of dust.[2]

The oracle in 11:10-16 also is dependent upon Second Isaiah.

The Messianic leader is to restore Jacob, and also become the leader and commander of the saved remnant of all the nations (45:4ff-49:5f). Thus Second Isaiah's picture of the Messianic era is religious rather than political. The work of the Messiah is not to be conceived in natural terms. The purpose of His advent is to save the whole world.[3]

---

1. Cf. 13:20-22 with 34:11-15.

2. The Second Isaiah. P. 107.

3. Ibid. P. 71.

Corley also approaches the problem of Isaiah's Messianic hope. through the relationship of the Second to the First Isaiah, but with different conclusions from those of Torrey, Corley believes the date of the Messianic oracles cannot be determined by the linguistic test. The best test of their genuineness is the historical. Do they fit into the text and the context? His conclusion is that all prophecies with reference to the Davidic Messiah do not fit either the text or the context and are therefore of a late date. He believes that no prophet would suggest that God would restore the throne of David to a descendent of David while David's latest heir was upon the throne.[1]

Corley finds five oracles in Isaiah 1-39 which deal with a Davidic Messiah. They are 9:5-6; 11:1-16; 16:5; 22:22-24; and 37:35. These are in conflict with the following passages in which no personal Messiah is mentioned: 2:24; 14:1,2; 17:7,8; 19:24,25. No Messianic significance is found in the Immanuel reference, 7:14. The key to the solution of the problem of the Messianic hope is to be found in the conflict existing between these two groups of passages. Isaiah's hope was not in a Davidic Messiah, though the hope was expressed by him in a general way. Second Isaiah, taking up the general prediction of a coming Messiah, acclaimed Cyrus as the fulfillment of this prophecy. In so doing, however, he erred as was observed by the editor who added the Second Isaiah to the First. This editor, therefore, sought to produce an authoritative corpus of prophecy of the golden age to come, and to found it upon the name of the greatest of the prophets of Judah.

---

1. "Messianic Prophecies in the First Isaiah." AJSL. Vol. 39. Pp. 220ff.

> Being aware that First Isaiah contained some Messianic prophecy which did not indicate that the Messiah was to be of the house and lineage of David, and that the writer of Second Isaiah had erred in acclaiming Cyrus as the Messiah, this editor added some Messianic interpolations to First Isaiah to correct what he regarded as a lack of clearness there and, at the same time, to offset the error of the book that he was in the act of incorporating with Isaiah's oracles, which we now, for want of a better designation, call Second Isaiah.[1]

Thus Corley finds the presence of the oracles referring to a Davidic Messiah in Isaiah 1-39 to be the result of the work of the compiler of the First and Second Isaiahs. He does not, however, state whether this compiler wrote the oracles himself or received them from some other source.

One of the most radical views holding to a post-exilic date for the Messianic hope is that of Kennett.[2] He believes that the "Old Testament abounds in passages expressing a glowing hope." The only way in which the origin of this hope may be ascertained is to move forward from a time when it did not exist to a time when its existence is an established fact. On this basis Kennett makes a survey of possible early references to a Messiah, but finds none.[3]

The Garden of Eden story shows nothing more than perpetual warfare between the descendents of the woman and the serpent. The only allusion to this story is in Isaiah 65:25 and possibly in Psalm 104:29. The mean- of the blessing passages, such as 28:14, 48:20, is merely that the

---

1. Op. cit. P. 224.

2. Old Testament Essays. P. 217.

3. Kennett holds a late dating for each of the documents. Had he found any Messianic reference in this literature, it would still be later than Isaiah's time. His dating is as follows: E (670), J (621-604) JE (just after 586), D (550-520) H (just after 573) P (520-445).

descendents of the patriarchs will be so prosperous that anyone wishing to give a blessing would say, "May God make thee as prosperous as he made the seed of Abraham." Likewise Kennett denies any Messianic significance to Genesis 49:10. He translates עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה "till he comes to Shiloh." This reading is explained on the ground that in Josiah's time Judah cherished the hope of regaining Samaria and thus the old sanctuary of Shiloh (Jeremiah 7:12,14).[1] The reading, "till Shiloh come is impossible" for we only know Shiloh as the name of a place. Kennett argues that "those who see a Messianic reference here are faced with the historic difficulty that the sceptre had departed ages before anyone came who was in any sense regarded as the Messiah.[2] Numbers 24:17 is merely a prediction that a ruler will rise who will subdue Moab and Edom. Deuteronomy 18:15 is nothing more than a statement that God will guarantee prophetic guidance to his people.

Isaiah had no Messianic hope. In 7:14 he was merely giving Ahaz a date. As long as the monarchy lasted the rank and file of the people of Judah were content with the Davidic dynasty. Isaiah did, indeed, say that the "House of David had wearied men," but he was voicing his own and not the people's opinion.

Jeremiah, in 22:30 says that no descendent of Jehoiakim will sit upon the throne. In Jeremiah 23:5-8, however, is a prediction that a shoot from the cut down tree of David will govern in righteousness. This exerted a great political influence. Zechariah and Haggai each

---

1. Cf. his date of the J document (621-604).

2. Op. Cit. 226.

express the hope that this prediction will be fulfilled in Zerubbabel.[1] We may therefore think of the Messianic hope as having been created by Jeremiah or one of his disciples, it matters not who.

The Messianic oracles in Isaiah 1-39, however, must be dated at a time much later than Jeremiah or Zerubbabel. They come from around the year 140, and the Messiah referred to is Simon, the High Priest. Identification of the Messiah with the House of David had been abandoned when the latter became sympathetic to the Hellenizing party. The hope itself had not been given up, but transferred to the poor.[2] In the years 143-142 the Seleucid government granted independence to the Jews, and there was at once a revival of the Messianic hope and Simon was regarded as the Messiah since he was virtually an independent prince who seemed to fulfill the predictions of Zechariah 9:9.

Kennett offers two arguments in support of his theory. No other period of history is known to which every clause of the oracles is applicable. The war boots mentioned in Isaiah 9:4.are such as were used in the Maccabean period.

> The boots here contemplated are evidently those which make a noise as the wearer walks, i.e. heavy nailed boots as distinct from the light shoes worn by orientals. Now high nailed boots were a characteristic of the Macedonian soldiery, and were still worn by the Syrian soldiery in the second century, B. C. In Theocritus, Id.XV.6, Gorgo the Syrian, is represented as exclaiming on the occasion of a military procession in Alexandria, "Everywhere military boots.' Isaiah in speaking of the equipment of the Assyrians uses the ordinary Hebrew word for shoe, סְאֹן ."[3]

---

1. Zech. 3:8; 6:12; Hag. 2:23.

2. Zech. 9:9; 12:7-13:1.

3. Composition of the Book of Isaiah. P. 71.

Similar to this view of Kennett is that of Aytoun who believes that the hope arose in the first place out of a larger and more fundamental hope in the restoration and regeneration of Israel.[1] The background of this hope was a belief in the perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty which was current during the time of the monarchy. The earliest scriptural reference we have to this belief comes from the seventh century, though it may have been enunciated in the time of David himself. The historical background of this earlier hope was lost, and a new hope, the Messinic was read into them.

Aytoun finds the Messianic oracles in 9:1-7 and 11:1-10 of a different quality from the other royalist oracles. They are on a higher level. The only oracle with which they show any kinship is Jeremiah 23:5-6 and they even show an advance over this. In neither of these oracles is reinstatement of the House of David of primary importance; it is merely a side issue.

If either of the oracles, Isaiah 9:1-7 or 11:1-10, had been in existence before the time of Haggai and Zechariah, it is difficult to understand how they would connect such a person as Zerubbabel with such a wonderful and exalted being as these oracles depict. Furthermore, there would hardly have been "a revival of royalist hopes till long after the Zerubbabel fiasco had been practically forgotten," We are to conclude therefore that these oracles are late post-exilic.

We do not need to understand Isaiah 11:1 as referring to a Davidic king. The explanation of "shoot" is to be found by comparing this verse

---

1."The Rise and Fall of the Messianic Hope in the Sixth Century." JBL. Vol. 39. P. 24ff.

with Daniel 11:7 where the woman referred to is Berenice of Egypt and the "shoot from her roots" is Ptolemy III, her brother. Thus this reference is to be taken to refer to Israel, and teaches that the Messiahship does not depend upon pedigree.

Berry finds all reference to the Messianic hope to be post-exilic.[1] The oracles in Isaiah do not fit into any period of the prophet's life, and they contemplate a rebuilding of the nation on a much more comprehensive scale than any of the genuine utterances of the prophet seem to indicate. The oracles in Jeremiah are out of accord with his thought and style, and those of Ezekiel are not in harmony with the context. Some expressions of the pre-exilic prophets are hostile to the Messianic idea, e.g. Isaiah 7:13, Jeremiah 13:13-14, 22:30. The foundation of the hope is to be found in II Samuel 7:12,14-16. It first found expression at the time of Zerubbabel. The oracles in Isaiah are from the Greek period.

Much more significance, Berry thinks, has been given this subject than a study of the Old Testament will warrant. The Messianic oracles are really more theocratic than Messianic. Yahweh is the principle actor of the oracles and not the Messiah. It is Yahweh who delivers and rebuilds the nation and puts the Messiah upon the throne.

The Messiah Himself is but a figurehead felt to be necessary to complete the picture of the rebuilding of the nation. He is always connected with the material side of the kingdom. Oracles that have a distinctly higher spiritual ideal make no reference to a Messianic king.

1."Messianic Predictions." JBL. Vol. 45 Pp232ff.

The Messiah is a literary rather than an historical figure, and is lacking in reality. He cannot be connected with any historical situation. There are two reasons for the introduction of this figure. The chief reason is because of the prediction in II Samuel 7 that the Davidic dynasty would be everlasting, but a secondary reason, among the later prophets, was the fact that the Messianic idea had become a prophetic tradition.

The ordinary presentation of the Messianic hope is dynastic rather than individualistic. The only Messianic passage in the whole Old Testament where hope is not connected with the Davidic dynasty is Isaiah 9:1-6. This oracle neither ascribes nor denies Davidic descent to the Messiah. The epithet פלא יועץ , however, is a combination of Hebrew words without precedent elsewhere in canonical scripture, and obviously describes a divine being.

The oracle in 11:1-5[1] differs from the general presentation of the hope in that here the Messiah is individualized and idealized. This is probably the latest expression of the hope in the Old Testament. It reflects the late apocalptic tendency and forms a link between the Messianic and apocalyptic types of literature.

Gray[2] prefers to leave the question of the origin and dates of the Messianic oracles in Isaiah 1-39 unsettled, though he leans toward a post-exilic date. The language is indecisive. It sounds like Ezekiel, but if Isaiah had believed in a future king, he would have described him much as

---

1. Berry limits the oracle at the opening of c.11 to the first five vs.
2. Isaiah, ICC P. 166 ff.

he is described here. He thinks there is no reference to these oracles in Jeremiah, Ezekiel or Second Isaiah. But this means nothing unless we accept a date as late as Kennett, for neither is there any echo of them in Haggai, Zechariah nor Malachi. There are insufficient grounds, however, for holding to Kennett's view. The names applied to the Messiah do not imply a warrior. There is no need to regard the reference to boots in 9:4 as the boots of Greek soldiers. The Messiah of 9:1-6 is a child, and not "an offspring given to the nation." Gray feels, however, that 11:1 points to a post-exilic date and he favors that accepted by Marti, ca. 500.

The majority of the above mentioned scholars who ascribe the origin of the Messianic hope to a time later than Isaiah do it with a note of finality. They feel that in so doing they have settled the question for all time. The problem, however, it not so easily settled, and there are certain questions which those scholars still must answer. The fact that the oracles are contained in that part of the book generally regarded as the work of Isaiah places the burden of proof upon those who would deny the prophet's authorship. And Kittel, whose ability in the field of Old Testament textual criticism must certainly be recognized says:

> It is only at the expense of great violence to the text of the Old Testament that it is possible to maintain that all these Messianic prophecies, or even the greater part of them, are the products of a late period.[1]

One argument offered against Isaianic authorship of the oracles is the difficulty of connecting them with any definite period of the prophet's life. Now if we must link the Messianic oracles with some defi-

---

1. Scientific Study of the Old Testament. P. 239.

nite situation in Isaiah's life before we can consider them authentic, why should not a similar demand be met before they are assigned to the post-exilic period? Wherein is the logic of denying these oracles to Isaiah because they cannot be definitely connected with any part of his life, and ascribing them to the post-exilic period without finding there a concrete situation into this they fit? Kennett feels this need and attempts to meet it by identifying the Messiah with Simon, but few critics feel that he had sufficient data to support his thesis.

The argument that the oracles could not have been written until the Davidic dynasty had already fallen does not have sufficient facts to support it. The word of Isaiah 11:1, גזע, may mean a stump or a sapling.[1] It may also refer to a tree the branches of which have been lopped off.[2] There is no etymological reason then for interpreting this word as referring to the fallen Davidic dynasty.

Is it any more logical to believe that hope would have arisen for the Davidic dynasty after the dynasty had completely failed than when it was only facing possible failure? Those who ascribe the oracles to a post-exilic date seem to think that it is. To those who hold to this reasoning Nowack[3] answers that in the exilic and the post-exilic periods the Messianic hope was already firmly extablished in the minds of the people. Moreover, the period of the exile, when the kingdom had been completely destroyed was a time when this hope was least likely to arise.

---

1. 40:24.

2. Louise Smith. JBL. Vol. 35. P. 173.

3. Die Zukunftshoffnungen Israels. Pp. 49f.

It must, therefore, have existed in some widely known form previous to the exile.

Edersheim attacks this argument from the standpoint of the post-exilic reaction to the House of David, and while his argument is not in all respects sound, it does deserve attention. He says:

> If the Messianic hope had sprung up during or immediately after the exile we should scarcely have expected it to cluster round the House of David, nor to center in the Son of David! For nothing is more marked than the decadence and almost disappearance of the House of David in that period. A national hope of this kind could scarcely have sprung up when the royalty of David was not only a matter of the past, but when its restoration was comparatively so little thought of or desired, that the descendents of the Davidic house seem in great measure to have become lost in the mass of the people. And the argument becomes all the stronger as we notice how, with the lapse of time, the Davidic line becomes increasingly an historical remembrance or a theological idea, rather than a present power or reality.[1]

We are asked why it is if Isaiah wrote the oracles that they are not reflected in Jeremiah, Second Isaiah or Ezekiel? To this there are two answers. It may be shown that the oracles are reflected in these prophets. Jeremiah 23:5ff has been widely considered Messianic, and claimed to be the first clear statement of the Messianic hope.[2] The use in this passage of צֶמַח to denote branch reflects a more developed idea than the חֹטֶר or נֵצֶר of Isaiah 11:1.[3] This would seem to indicate that Jeremiah 23:5ff reflects Isaiah 11:1 rather than vice versa. As for the reflection of the idea in Ezekiel, compare Ezekiel 37:24ff with

---

1. Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah P.17.

2. The authenticity of this passage is questioned, but it is genuinely Jeremanic in spirit. Kautssch (HBD Ext. Vol. P. 696a) deprives it of Messianic significance, but holds to its authenticity.

3. The idea of חֹטֶר and נֵצֶר is of a shoot just beginning to spring forth, while the root idea of צָמַח is to spring forth luxuriently.

Isaiah 9:6 and 11:2-4. The influence of the oracles upon Second Isaiah will be dealt with in a later chapter of this dissertation. But even if the influence of the Isaianic oracles could not be shown at all in the later prophets there is a second answer to those who deny their authenticity on these grounds. We may just as readily ask, "Why is not Isaiah's doctrine of faith or the remnant, both undisputed ideas of the prophet, set forth clearly in these later prophets?" The answer is the same in this case as in the of the Messianic hope. Merely because a prophet has expressed an idea does not mean that every succeeding prophet must echo it.

CHAPTER V THE MESSIANIC HOPE: A NEW APPROACH AND SOLUTION

In the preceding chapters a review has been given of various theories of the origin and authenticity of the Messianic hope in Isaiah 1-39. Each of these views has been carefully appraised, and none of them has seemed an adequate solution of the problem. It has furthermore been shown that there existed previous to Isaiah's time a belief in the permanence and prosperity of the Davidic dynasty.[1] Nowhere, however, has there been found any data that will justify the belief that anyone previous to his time predicted a glorious New Age, made possible by the advent of a Messiah such as is clearly set forth in Isaiah 9:1-6 and 11: 1-9. We now face the question whether these and other Messianic prophecies are the work of Isaiah and, if so, what gave rise to this idea in the prophet's thought.

In seeking a solution of this problem we shall consider the significance of the rite of anointing and the role of the king in the Hebrew Cultus. This will be done for the purpose of obtaining a possible understanding of Isaiah's attitude toward the kingship and the part the Messiah is to play in bringing about the New Age. Consideration will also be given to Isaiah's dealings with the two kings, Ahaz and Hezekiah. A study will then be made of the Messianic predictions of Isaiah 1-39 in the light of these findings. In this study we shall also make use of material from the Ras Shamra Texts which seems to throw light upon the origin of the Messianic hope.

---

1. Ch. 2. P. 33ff.

The root meaning of the Hebrew word, מָשַׁח, is "to wipe" or "to stroke." It is so used in Jeremiah 22:14 of the painting of a house with vermilion, and in Isaiah 21:5 of the smearing of a shield (cf. I Samuel 1:21) (text corrupt). It corresponds to the Arabic Masaha (tamas-suh), used of rubbing the hand over an idol. In Hebrew practice, however, anointing was done by pouring oil upon the head.[1]

The common Hebrew word for "oil" is, שֶׁמֶן . In most cases this denotes vegetable oil, though in some cases it refers to animal fat.[2] Robertson Smith has pointed out that the nomadic Semites knew nothing of vegetable oils.[3] He, therefore, claims that שֶׁמֶן originally meant animal fat. The use of this in anoiting probably dates back to primitive times, when men were anointed that they might receive some desired characteristic, e.g. courage, from the totem animal. Since the life of the animal was believed to reside in the fat, the characteristics of the animal were transmitted to the anointed. According to Smith,

> Anointing may often be regarded as a mode of transmitting either the sacred power of which the liquid was the symbol or vehicle, or the inherent nutritive and other properties with which it was credited.
>
> We are plainly led to the conclusion that unction is primarily an application of the sacrifical fat, with its living virtue, to the persons of the worshippers. On this view the anointing of kings, and the use of unguents on visiting the sanctuary, are at once intelligible.[4]

---

1. I Sam. 10:1; II Kgs. 9:6; Ps. 133:2; Jacob poured oil on his Maccebah; Gen. 28:18.

2. Gen. 49; Jg. 3:29; Deut. 32:15; Isa. 5:10,10:16,25:6; Jer. 5:28; Ezek. 34:16; Hab. 1:16.

3. Robertson Smith. Religion of The Semites. Third Edition. P.233.

4. Ibid. Pp. 583, 383.

The underlying idea of anointing seems then to have been the bringing of the anointed person into a special relationship to Yahweh. According to Weinel,

> When the priest at the holy place pours consecrated oil on the king's head, he conveys the material and character of holiness to him, and makes him a participator in Yahweh's superior life.[1]

Yahweh's anointed as such becomes inviolable.[2]

In pre-exilic times this rite seems to have bgen practically confined to kings. Elijah is told to anoint Elisha,[3] but there is no account of its having been done. Another possible exception is found in Amos 6:6. The anointing of Priests did not take place until post-exilic times,[4] and may be a result of lingering monarchical aspirations.[5] In Isaiah 61:1 anointing is used in a metaphorical sense for consecration to the prophetic office.

Whether or not all Hebrew kings were anointed is not clearly stated in the Old Testament. Saul was elevated to kingship by anointing (I Samuel 10:1)and so was David (ISamuel 16:13). The latter may have received two anointings, as king over Judah (II Samuel 2:4), and again over all Israel (II Samuel 55:3). When there was any question, however, as to who should be king, anointing took place. Thus Solomon was

---

1. "ZATW." Vol. 18 Pp. 1f.

2. I Samuel 24:7,11; 26:9-11, 16,23; II Sam. 1:14,16; 19:22.

3. I Kgs. 19:66.

4. Der Messias P. 4. Gray. Sacrifices in the Old Testament. Pp258f.

5. C. R. North. "Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship." ZATW Vol. 50 P.13.

anointed in David's lifetime. Joash was anointed by Jehoiada, and Jehoahaz in preference to Jehoiakim. Jehu is the only king of the Northern Kingdom whose anointing is mentioned.

The practice of anointing was undoubtedly borrowed by the Hebrews from another people. Gressmann believes they took it over from the Amorites, though where the latter got the practice it is not possible today to answer.[1] North agrees with this and cites Jotham's fable as proof that this practice was engaged in by the old Canaanites.[2] Our attention is also called to one of the Tel-el-Armana letters in which a certain Adduniarari writes to the Pharaoh,

> See, when Mananbiria (ThutmoseIII) king of Egypt, thy grandfather, made Taku, my grandfather, king in Nuhashshe, and put oil upon his head.....[3]

Thus far no one has found evidence of the rite of anointing in Babylonia or Assyria, and it would seem that the Hebrews received the rite from the Canaanites, who, in turn, may have taken it over from Egypt.

The bestowal of Yahweh's Spirit also served to bring one into special relationship to Him. The Spirit descended upon Othniel (Judges 3:10) Gideon (Judges 6:34) and Jephthah (Judges 11:29), elevating each of these men to the office of judge. There are three references to the coming of the Spirit upon Samson (Judges 14:6-19, 15:14). With the creation of the office of kingship the bestowal of the Spirit became connected with the rite of anointing. Saul received the Spirit subsequent to being anointed.

---

1. Der Messias P. 5.

2. North. ZATW. Vol. 50 P. 14.

3. Armana (Knudtzon No 51 lines 4-6).

by Samuel (I Samuel 1-:6,10). Moreover, the Spirit departed from Saul when David was anointed, and an evil spirit troubled him. At the same time Yahweh's Spirit rushed mightily upon David (I Samuel 16:13f).[1] Kautzsch thinks that the connection of anointing with the bestowal of the Spirit was original with the Hebrews. He says:

> A specifically Israelitish origin may be confidently claimed for the connecting of the anointing with the bestowal of the Spirit of Yahweh This answers best to the idea of the Spirit of Yahweh as the principle which shows its creative activity on all sides, and which gives birth to special powers---an idea whose many-sided development and application we owe undoubtedly to Yahwism alone.[2]

It has been shown that the purpose of anointing was to bring the king into special relationship with Yahweh. It now becomes necessary to consider the nature of that relationship. To be sure the Messianic king is nowhere spoken of as Yahweh's anointed, but inasmuch as he is to reign upon the throne of David, it seems logical to suppose that he would hold some relationship to the current conception of kingship. Was the Messiah to be, as Robertson Smith suggests,[3] only the fulfillment of the Hebrew ideal of kingship, achieved in a good, but still human king? Or was he to be a superhuman being through whom God will work in a miraculous way? Such questions can be answered only by a consideration of the popular and the prophetic attitude toward kingship.

There is no question but that kingship in the ancient East was

---

1. The lateness of the accounts discredits their being accepted as history. They do, however, show the attitude held at the time they were written.

2. HBD. Ext. Vol. P. 660a.

3. Prophets of Israel P. 347.

dominated by religious ideas. There is a difference of opinion among scholars as to what extent these ideas were taken over by the Hebrews. Mowinckel is sure that the use of the King's Psalms at the "Thronbesteiungsfest" is proof of the deification of kings in Israel and argues that this belief was part of the living religion of early Israel.[1] Hölscher, on the other hand, says that Yahwism refused to have anything to do with the idea of king deification.[2] North, who argues against such deification does admit, however, that the actual history of Israel and Judah may be very different from the Old Testament records, which are essentially post-exilic and so colored by the Deuteronomic and priestly schools.[3] Gressmann makes a distinction between deification in life and after death. He finds that among the smaller Semitic peoples, it was only occasionally that a living king was deified, although such instances are not absolutely unknown. The only instance recorded in the present text of the Old Testament is in Psalm 45:7.[4]

Johnson maintains that the king played a "vital rôle" in the Jerusalem cultus of the monarchical period. Underlying this function of the king is the idea of the social solidarity of the group. The nation as a "psychic whole," has an extention in time as well as in space due to the fact that "the individual is regarded as a center of power which extends far beyond the mere contour of the body and mingles with

---

1. Psalmen studien Vol. 2 P. 302.

2. Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion. P. 31.

3. ZATW. Vol. 50 P. 8.

4. Der Messias P. 38f.

that of the family and the family property, the tribe and the tribal possessions, or the nation and the national inheritance."[1] The king through his anointing becomes the channel of divine power. As such he is the perpetual light (Ner Tammid),[2] the life force,[3] the shadow that gives protection,[4] the shield of the people.[5] Furthermore, the king must be SADDÎK, the incarnation of SEDEK, since the nation has its "focus in the House of David," and it "is ultimately dependent for its existence upon the SEDEK of Yahweh." Thus the king becomes the mediator between Yahweh and man, standing in unique relationship to each other.

There are two possible approaches to the study of the divine nature of the kingship: one by the way of the Old Testament historical records; the other through a study of the cult practices that existed at the time of the monarchy. It will contribute to an understanding of the origin of the Messianic hope to consider this subject from each of these approaches.

The historical account dealing with the time previous to the establishment of the monarchy tells of leaders who were such because of their nearness to Yahweh. In other words it is Yahweh who leads the Hebrews through these human agents. The latter becomes what Goodenough has termed the νόμος ἔμψυχος , the living law. As such they held

---

1. Rôle of Kings, S. H. Hooke's Labrinth P. 75.

2. I Sam. 21:17; Ps. 132:17,18; I Kgs. 11:36, 15:4; II Kgs. 8:19.

3. Lam. 4:20.

4. Lam. 4:20

5. Ps. 84:10, 89:19.

the same relationship to Yahweh and the people as later the kings held when they fulfilled the duties of kingship according to the highest conception of that office.

> If the books of Judges, Samuel, Kings and Chronicles have anything to teach, it is that this sort of kingship was universally axiomatic to the people. Similarly, in later history, in the time of Israel's decline and collapse as a nation, while the people despaired at not having found ideal kings to save them from their enemies, yet they preserved the old terms of king adulation and trust, and transposed them into passionate expectation that still in the future such a king would come. It is no set of "Hofstil" phrases which have thus been transformed into the enduring hope in Isaiah. Such objects of racial devotion as the Messianic hope of Israel comes not in practice from foaming phrases, but from the heart's deepest convictions of a people. And this great hope came from the king-faith of a nation that had long looked in vain to its rulers for the salvation of Yahweh, but had looked with such implicit belief that when kings and the nation were no more, still the faith found a way to survive.[1]

Through the period of the Judges it is Yahweh working through His νόμος ἔμψυχος that protects Israel. In hopeless disorder, Israel faces defeat until Yahweh raises up a judge-ruler who becomes Israel's saviour. It is generally accepted today that these accounts have a marked Deuteronomic coloring and are not to be accepted as historically accurate. They do, however, give us the philosophy of history which was held by the Deuteronomic editors.

In the two conflicting accounts of the establishment of the monarchy we have two correspondingly conflicting political philosophies. In one account, ISamuel 9:1-10:16, generally regarded as belonging to J, and the older of the two accounts, Yahweh grants Israel a king because of His compassion upon her. It is evident that this account comes from a school of thought which held that Yahweh's rule over his people could

---

1. JBL. vol. 48 P. 169.

only be effectively carried out through the medium of a king.[1] This thought is reflected in a refrain that appears four times in the Book of Judges: "In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes."[2] Budde has made an interesting suggestion, worthy of consideration, that when Samuel invites Saul to dinner, (ISamuel 9:22f) he sets before him a dish containing the fat of the sheep's tail, a portion of food reserved for deity. By so doing Samuel recognized the divine kingship of Saul.[3] In the other account, I Samuel 7:15-8:22, 10:17-24, 12:1-25), which is attributed to E, Yahweh is opposed to the establishment of the monarchy. He can no longer be king in the true sense if a human king rises between Him and the people.

The records of the reign of David deal largely with his wars of conquest. As king, however, he is more than a military leader under Yahweh. He is a shepherd over the people (II Samuel 7:8).[4] His reign is characterized by justice and righteousness (II Samuel 8:15f). In the poem commonly called, David's last Words (II Samuel 21:1ff), the king element is strong. As the anointed of God, David is highly exalted. He is in a special relationship to the Spirit of Yahweh which speaks through him and he is compared to the light of the sun when it rises.

---

1. Goodenough points out that Philo (Vit.Mos.I,9) holds that Moses was a king, and that he was called god and king of the whole human race. JBL. vol. 48, P. 181.

2. 17:6, 18:1, 19:1, 21:25.

3. Samuel in KHC. P. 64f.

4. E document.

In the story of the woman of Tekoa,[1] David is addressed by her as, "My Lord, the king", and characterized as one who discerns good and evil as the angel of God. (II Samuel 14:17,20). Goodenough argues that this shows the woman did not regard David as deity.

This brings up an interesting suggestion made by Nicklin that in many places in the Old Testament where we have the words מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה (the angel of God),[2] the original text reads מֶלֶךְ אֱלֹהִים (God, the king).[3] In every case this expression is found in books upon which the revisers have worked. Nicklin calls attention to the fact that the name מֹלֶךְ, Moloch, is derived by adding the vowels of בֹּשֶׁת, to מֶלֶךְ, king, and that in Psalm 8:5 the LXX and Syraic have מַלְאָכִים where the Hebrew has אֱלֹהִים. The change took place because the prophets discouraged the use of the former expression.

North is of the opinion that it was a definitely Yahwistic movement which produced the monarchy. In support of his argument he cites the fact that Gray shows how names compounded with Yah first become frequent in the Davidic period, and that such names are distributed in a manner deserving attention. [3] There are seventeen in all. Of these one is a son of Saul, three are sons of David, and three are nephews of David. Seven of the seventeen are members of royal families. Nor is this all. Four others are connected with David's court, one as a priest and another as a priest's son. This leaves only four among the rank and file of the common people,

---

1. J. document.

2. Expository Times Vol. 33. 378f.

3. Gen. 21:17, Judges 6:12-20, Gen. 48:15,16, Hos. 12:3,4,5.

and of each of these four names there is textual uncertainty.

Graham takes issue with North on this point, maintaining that the cultural origin of the Hebrews is not easy to understand. He says:

> Remembering the social functions of religion, one can hardly accept the idea that the Hebrew monarchy was made by Yahwism, since there is just as much truth in assertion that Yahwism was made by the Hebrew monarchy.[1]

Graham goes on further to say that we beg the question when we argue the non-existence of the idea of divine kingship in Israel on the grounds that the prophets did not denounce it. He claims that if the prophets had been opposed to this idea they would not have pictured Yahweh as king.

It has already been shown that the purpose of anointing was to bring the king into special relationship with Yahweh. It can also be shown that the king stood in a covenant relationship to the people. David becomes the king of all Israel through a covenant with the people made possible by the work of Abner.[2] Jehoiada re-establishes the covenant, which had been broken by the usurpation of Athaliah, for the young king Joash.[3] The people could impose new demands on a monarch at the time of his accession.[4] Even in the last days of the kingdom of Judah popular choices might raise to the throne a prince who was not the heir apparent.[5] Only two Hebrew kings, according to North, were typical oriental despots, and it is significant, as he says, that "the people would not suffer a repetition of

---

1. AJSL vol. 50 P. 211.
2. II. Sam. 3:21, 5:3.
3. II Kg. 11:17f.
4. I Kg. 12:4.
5. II Kg. 23:30.

the one while the other was forced upon them against their will by an alien power.[1]

In appraising the historical accuracy of these records we must always keep in mind the influence of the Deuteronomists. This school is clearly against the idea of divine kingship,[2] but this very fact may show the existence of the idea in Israel, against which the Deuteronomists are here protesting. And the account which finds Yahweh favorable to the monarchy may have been back of this idea. Thus while the Old Testament historical records as we have them do not prove the existence of the idea of divine kingship, neither can the non-existence of this institution be proved by them.

A few passages that bring the king into a unique relationship to God should be kept in mind. In II Samuel 7:14, the king is spoken of as Yahweh's son. To curse the king is as heinous offense as to curse God. (Exodus 22:28, I Kings 21:10). The royal palace and the temple are as one, and the kings were buried in the sacred area (Ezekiel 43:7f).

An approach to the subject of divine kingship followed by Hooke is through a study of ritual prohibitions. He says:

> It is clear that a prohibition presupposes a practice, and the fact that these practices are prohibited, some of them in the earliest stages of Hebrew religion, shows that they existed in Canaan, and had been adapted to some extent by the Hebrews, among whom, indeed they continued to survive till a comparatively late date.[3]

Three ritual prohibitions especially seem to argue for divine kingship.

---

1. "Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship," ZATW. vol. 50 P. 57.

2. Deut. 17:21.

3. Myth And Ritual. P. 70.

In Exodus 23:19 and Deuteronomy 14:21 are to be found prohibitions against seething a kid in its mother's milk. Taken by itself this prohibition is meaningless. In the Osirian mysteries this was a part of the ritual for the deification of the king. The condemnation of this rite in the Old Testament is due, no doubt, to the fact that there had been an effort on the part of the Hebrews to take over the rite for themselves. A prohibition against making steps to the altar is recorded in Exodus 20:26a. In Canaanite culture the altar with the steps leading up to it had a special significance in the king deification ritual. In the coronation ritual of Ramesseum Papyrus there is a scene which shows the priest making a ladder by which the dead king may ascend to heaven. The prohibition against incest in Leviticus 18:6f and Deuteronomy 27:22 may rest back upon an Egypt practice, beginning with the Fifth Dynasty in which the divine king, the son of Ra, was obliged to marry his own sister.

Further evidence of the deification of the king can be seeen in the ritual literature of some of the Psalms. Reference has already been made to the fact that in Psalm 89 the king is spoken of as Yahweh's son. The reference is to verse 28 in which Yahweh says, "I indeed will make him my first born, high over the kings of the earth." The exact translation of עֶלְיוֹן is uncertain, and this may be a play upon the divine name, Elyon, a deity of pre-Israelite Jerusalem.[1] The verse would then read, "I indeed will make him, My first-born, Elyon to the kings of the earth." If this was the original sense of the verse, then we have here the idea of king deification. Briggs claims that the word, בְּכוֹר , is used here

---

1. S. H. Hooke, The Labrinth P. 79.

not in a natural sense, but in the sense of official adoption.[1] Cheyne interprets it as meaning that the king of Israel is an image of Yahweh, and that other kings are but images of the inferior gods.[2] B oth of these ideas if carried out to their logical conclusions would imply some idea of deification. A similar reference to the king as Yahweh's son is to be found in Psalm 2:7. Here the relationship is definitely adoptive as brought out by the phrase, "This day have I begotten thee."

In Psalm 45:7, the king is directly addressed as Deity. All versions render אלהים here as vocative except the Targum. Briggs accepts the verse as a reference to the king on the grounds that the use of the second person in verses 5, 6 and 8 are against reference to God, and claims that all the many attempts to explain the verse as something else fail to satisfy.[3] Even North, who argues against any idea of divine kingship in Israel, feels compelled to admit this verse is against his thesis.[4]

In recent years a great deal of work has been done to show that the Feast of the Tabernacles was celebrated as the re-enthronement of Yahweh as king. This celebration came after the harvest "at the year's exit".[5] Its purpose was to ensure the requisite supply of rain and guarantee the crops of the coming year. Thus the welfare of the group

---

1. Psalms. ICC. Vol. 2. P. 260.
2. Book of Psalms. P. 249.
3. Psalms ICC. Vol. 1. P. 387.
4. ZATW. Vol. 50.P. 37.
5. Ex. 23:16. Ex. 34:22.

was dependent upon this celebration.[1]

The ritual of the Feast of the Tabernacles had been reconstructed by Johnson in his essay, "The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus."[2] The culmination of this festival he finds to be the re-creative activity of Yahweh which takes place in the form of a ritual drama. Psalm 89 contains the ritual of this drama. In this the king plays the part which Yahweh had originally played in creation. As Yahweh has struggled with the forces of Darkness and brought about creation, so in the new year ritual the king struggles with the kings of the earth. He is suffering humiliation, but when the outlook is the blackest, Yahweh intervenes on his behalf and saves him (and, ipso facto, his people) from Death.[3]

From the data before us we may draw certain conclusions. (1) The Old Testament shows that in the period of the monarchy the belief existed that the welfare of the nation was dependent upon the king being in the right relationship to Yahweh. (2) There are glimmerings in the Old Testament of the practice of king-deification. Gressmann speaks of it as the Annäherung (approximation) of deification,[4] and Lods says the people "did adopt belief in the supernatural powers and almost divine character of the king."[5] (3) Those who hold to the theory of king-deifi-

---

1. Zech. 14:16-17.
2. In S. H. Hooke's, The Labyrinth.
3. The same view is held by Mowinckel in Psalmenstudien Vol.II. P. 506f.
4. Der Messias. P. 25.
5. The Prophets and The Rise of Judaism. P. 70f.

deification in Israel find the data to support their theory mainly in ritual prohibitions and the Psalms. As for the prohibitions, they show clearly a feeling against the practice. The idea may have been preserved in the Psalms due to the fact that the original use of this literature was forgotten, and a new meaning given to its contents.[1] (4) The historical literature, where the Deuteronomic editors have been at work, is definitely against the idea of king deification. Gressmann says it is because these editors have torn out all such references which were offensive to them that we do not have an actual account of such deification in Israel.[2] (5) We are justified, therefore, in believing that one phase of Canaanite culture breaking in upon Israel's religious life was king deification, and that possibly at some time in Hebrew history this cult was practiced for the purpose of securing prosperity to the nation.

What, now, was Isaiah's attitude toward the kingship, and what was his relationship to the kings of his day? These questions must be answered before we can decide whether Isaiah was the author of the Messianic hope. The prophet's relationship to the royal court was determined, however, by his religious belief, and to understand that relationship we must keep in mind certain beliefs which the prophet considered fundamental. Kittel has rightly said:

> Isaiah regarded politics from a religious point of view. His attitude toward the political affairs of his day was this, that in order to understand thoroughly the true nature of anything, it is necessary to regard it from the point of view

---

1. See Eissfeldt. Einleitung In Das A. T. P. 502ff.

2. Der Messias. P. 42.

> of religion, as well as from other points of view, i. e., that a consideration of what might be the will of God and the decrees of heaven, and of the fundamental and universal moral laws, can not be ignored.[1]

Underlying all of Isaiah's teachings is his doctrine of faith in God. For him the greatest sin is unbelief or lack of faith. Knudson points out that while Isaiah does not give expression to this doctrine as frequently as Hosea does his doctrine of love yet "it is clear to the careful student that this represents his fundamental thought."[2] Because of this doctrine Isaiah had no sympathy with those whose trust was in magic (2:6,8. 8:19), or military might (2:7,15. 31:1), in self conceit (5:21. 19:4. 31:2) or diplomacy (3:1ff. 20:5. 30:1ff). According to the prophet all security was to be found in absolute trust in God (7:9. 28:16. 30:15). Inasmuch as this is one of Isaiah's fundamental doctrines it is at once evident that he would want the king, above all, to be a man of faith.

Another of Isaiah's doctrines which has bearing upon our subject is that of the holiness of Yahweh (1:4. 6:3. 10:20. 12:6). Because Yahweh was holy, only holy men could stand in his presence (6:5-6. 17:7). Graham believes Isaiah insisted upon the holiness of Yahweh because of the current belief in unmoral and impersonal deities. Against this belief, held by the king and people of Judah, Isaiah gave his teaching that Y ahweh is a moral person,manifesting his power in the whole world.[3] We have already seen that Kittel finds in this doctrine the

---

1. Scientific Study of The Old Testament. P. 237.
2. Beacon Lights of Prophecy. P. 150.
3. The Prophets And Israel's Culture. P. 53.

basis for Isaiah's hope in a New Age, and the thought that led to his Messianic conception. Robertson Smith finds Isaiah's doctrine of the holiness of Yahweh one of the strong determining factors of all his relationships to the royal court.

> To put the thought in modern language, the proof that God is with Israel, and with Israel alone, lies in this, that no other conception of godhead than that of the Holy God preached by Israel's prophets can justify itself as consistent with the course of the Assyrian calamity. The world is divided between two religions, the religion that worships things of man's making, and the religion of the Holy One of Israel. Judah is called to choose between these faiths, and its rulers have chosen the former. Their trust is in earthly things:- be these chariots and horses, strong cities and munitions of war, commercial wealth and agricultrual prosperity, carnal alliances and schemes of human policy, or idols, altars, and sunpillars, is alike to Isaiah's judgment. When Yahweh rises in judgment all these vain helpers are swept away, and the Holy One of Israel alone remains. The plan of earthly policy which Ahaz and his counsellors had matured with so much care are likened by the prophet to the Adonis gardens or pots of quickly withering flowers which the ancients used to set at their doors or in the courts of temples.[1]

A third of Isaiah's doctrines which may have related to the Messianic hope is that of the remnant. That the prophet considered this an important doctrine is proved by the fact that it was expressed in the name of one of his sons.[2] Scholars have differed as to the real meaning of the remnant. Some say it refers to the prophet's disciples.[3] Others think it refers to the cleansed and purified (in a special sense) people, who are fit subjects for the Messianic Ruler.[4] Micklem argues that the word, שאר has almost a technical sense with the prophets , and that

---

1. The Prophets and Israel's Culture. P. 53.
2. 7:3.
3. Skinner: CB. Isa. 40-66. P xxvii. Duhm. Kommentar P. 65.
4. Oesterley Op. Cit. P. 208. Cf. Welch Op. Cit. P. 171.

its real meaning is "a remnant will turn to God." What the prophet sought to teach then was that,

> The eternal purposes of God could not altogether fail; His glory should yet be manifested; civilization might be destroyed, but religion would not die; a remnant would turn. But who should compose the remnant? Ephraim was reprobate, Judah seemed reprobate; but even now, if Judah had faith, she should be established; Judah might yet be a remnant; now was the testing time. This is the significance of Shear-yashub's presence on this occasion, and his name is closely connected with the oracle in verse 9b.

It has been argued that Isaiah's idea of the remnant was but an added note of emphasis to his message of doom, in the sense that only a remnant would return. Even granting that, the fact remains that a remant would return. Consequently, the question might be asked, "What will happen to the remnant?" That Isaiah believed that Yahweh would in some way re-establish this remnant is shown by his words in chapter 1:24-26, a passage that is generally regarded as authentic.

In addition to these teachings of the prophet another fact must be kept in mind. Recent scholarship has brought to light the fact that Isaiah made use in his teaching of the thought pattern of the Canaanite fertility religions, often using this in an ironical way to add emphasis to his own adverse ideas.[1] Fisher has singled out eleven general topics under which the prophet made use of the cult terms in his teachings.[2] If, then, there can be discovered in the Canaanite religion anything that might give rise to the Messianic hope, we are justified in believing that such may have been a contributing factor in the origin of this hope.

---

1. Leslie. The Prophets Tell Their Own Story. P. 85f.

2. Isaiah and the Nature Cults.

We come now to Isaiah's relationship to the kings of his day. The title of the prophecy declares that Isaiah's work extended through the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah. His call, however, came "in the year that King Uzziah died" (6:1), and there is no other mention in the prophecy of Jotham. Jotham could not have lived long after Isaiah received his call,[1] for at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic war, Ahaz was the reigning monarch. Our study, then is limited to Isaiah's relationship to the two kings, Ahaz and Hezekiah.

The record of Ahaz's reign is given in II Kings 16. He is described as one "who did not that which was right in the eyes of Yahweh." (verse 2). Lumby [2] argues that the presence of the negative in this phrase, deviating from the customary way of appraising a bad king,[3] shows that Ahaz was held in special contempt. The reference to the sacrifice of his own son and his worship at the high places and under every green tree (verses 3-4) shows him to have been a follower of Canaanite cults, since both of these practices were connected with such cults. He used the silver and gold of the temple to pay tribute to the king of Assyria.[4] Upon his return from Damascus he brought the pattern for a new altar, presumably of a Syrian deity, which he caused to be built for the temple. The Kings record cannot be accepted as historically accurate in all details, due to its Deuteronomic revision, but it

---

1. His death may have occurred in 735.
2. CB. Kgs. P. 159.
3. "He did that which was evil' is the formula used otherwise.
4. Confirmed in the records of Tiglath-Pileser. KB IV 18.

may be accepted as a general statement of fact.[1] Such practices on the part of the king would have been especially offensive to Isaiah. Moreover, from the prophecy itself we know that Ahaz was offensive to him because of his lack of faith in Yahweh.[2] Ahaz was seeking help from Assyria, and in this Isaiah could see nothing but defeat for Ahaz and hardship for Judah. Graham argues that the אדני of 7:20 refers to Ahaz himself. This is probably true for it is unlikely that the prophet would have spoken so irreverently of Yahweh. We may assume, then, that the prophet looked for Ahaz's downfall.

The account of Hezekiah's reign, II Kings 18:20, is favorable to this monarch. In II Kings 18:1-8, he is praised for destroying the high places with their accompanying Maccēboth and Asherim. The authenticity of this passage has been questioned. Both Stade and Wellhausen regard it as a later interpolation.[3] Even if the passage is accepted as authentic, it need not be understood that Hezekiah was always as virtuous as he is therein pictured. Jeremiah (26:17-19) refers to the influence of Micah upon the king, and the inference to be drawn from his words is that Hezekiah had not always been a Yahweh enthusiast.

As in the case of Ahaz, Isaiah was out of patience with Hezekiah because of the latter's lack of faith in Yahweh. Hezekiah's turning to Egypt for help was to the prophet an affront to the Holy One of Israel (31:1-3). The king should be looking to Yahweh who alone could help,

---

1. Eissfeldt (Einleitung in das A.T. P. 336), claims the Detueronomists have not altered essential facts, but merely colored them to suit their ends.

2. 7:9b-13.

3. Stade, Geschichte 607f. Wellhausen, Kommentar P. 291.

and not to the men and horses of Egypt. If we may accept Isaiah 19:8 as authentic then Hezekiah was willing to listen to the prophet. The fact that Isaiah predicts an exile to Babylonia (verses 6-7) supports the idea that chapter 39 has been altered by the redactors. It is more likely that it originally referred to an exile to Assyria.[1] If Isaiah did believe Hezekiah's sons would be made eunuchs, then he certainly believed the Davidic dynasty would end.

The fact that Isaiah changes his mind in regard to Hezekiah's recovery from sickness is interesting. In 38:2 he predicts that the king will die, but in 38:5 Hezekiah is told he will have fifteen more years to live. Fisher claims that Hezekiah's sickness is a ritual act on his part.[2] He is playing the part of the dying-rising god that by this ritual act he may secure help against the Assyrians who are at the gates of Jerusalem. For that reason Isaiah tells him that he really will die. In his extremity the king turns to Yahweh and the prophet. Then it is that Isaiah alters his verdict. The definite mention of the נפש in verse 21, and the דבלה which the prophet prescribes for it would seem to forbid this interpretation.[3] The fact remains, however, that Isaiah changes his attitude toward the king, and there must have

---

1. Burney, HBD. Vol. 2 P. 870a. holds this view. Lumby, CB. Kgs.) thinks the text originally referred to Assyrians being taken to Babylon.

2. Isaiah and the Nature Cults P. 35ff.

3. It is interesting, however, that דבלה is a word contained in the Ras Shamra texts where it refers to an ointment to be used on horses. Syria XV P. 75.) Could the use of his word thus be irony or the prophet's part, which would substantiate Fisher's view?

been some reason for it. The whole tenor of the account supports the idea that Hezekiah, facing grave difficulties (of which the sickness may have been only a small part) and realizing his dilemma, turns to the prophet's God for help.

We are now in a position to answer our question regarding Isaiah's attitude toward the kingship, and his relationship to the kings of his day. Since the belief existed that the welfare of the nation was dependent upon the king being in the right relationship to Yahweh, Isaiah would naturally make it his business to show what the relationship should be. Yahweh, the holy God, would demand spiritual purity and faith from the king. The king should take on the ethical and moral attributes of Yahweh.[1] We have seen that both Ahaz and Hezekiah fell short of this ideal. It would be logical, then, to believe that Isaiah set forth the doctrine of a Messianic king as an antitype to either of these kings who, to the prophet at least, were failures. Our next step, then, will be to ascertain whether there is any situation in Isaiah's dealings with either of these kings which might have produced this thought.

Isaiah came into open conflict with Ahaz at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic threat.[2] Taking his son, Shear-Yashub, Isaiah goes out to the city resevoir to meet the king. Ahaz has realized the city water supply is not adequate to withstand a siege. He has had the new Siloah canal built. "This is in the eyes of Isaiah a sin, a malicious rebellion

---

1. This fact is substantiated by the fact that Isaiah calls Yahweh the King (6:5). Back of this statement must be the thought that the king should be like Yahweh.

2. 7:1ff.

against the will of God, a denial of faith."[1] Isaiah confronted Ahaz with the assertion, "If you do not trust, you will not be trusted (7-9). Then follows the enigmatic passage 7:10-17, dealing with the almah and Immanuel sign. This passage has been a real stumbling block to Old Testament scholars. Kraeling has gone so far as to regard the whole account as a legend which was inspired by Isaiah 8:1-14.[2] It originally accupied a place in II Kings between, verses 4 and 17, from which it was taken by the compilers of Isaiah and placed in the position it now holds. To call such a passage legendary is an easy method of exegesis, but in this case it is unnecessary. The Ras Shamra mythological texts have thrown some new light upon a possible explanation of Isaiah's sign and its meaning. This new explanation gives us a possible solution to the Messianic problem.

The greatest difficulty in reaching a satisfactory interpretation of this passage has rested in the impossibility of identifying Immanuel and the Almah. Duhm maintains that the definite article הַ is a reference to species, and the הָעַלְמָה may be any young woman. Retaining the ordinary significance of the article and translating "The almah," three possible solutions have been suggested; (1) Some definite member of the royal harem,[3] (2) the prophet's wife, (3) the mother of the

---

1. Gressmann, Der Messias. P. 237.

2. JBL. Vol. 50. Pp. 277ff.

3. The wife of Ahaz has also been suggested but this seems unlikely since then Isaiah would have used the ordinary title, הַמַּלְכָּה.

Messiah. Each of these interpretations presents difficulties. In the first two cases how would Isaiah know ahead of time the sex of the child? If the almah were any other than the prophet's wife how did he know what name would be given to the child? Yet to identify the almah with the prophet's wife is out of the question since Isaiah already had a son.[1] The third possibility has been generally rejected on the grounds that no such Messiah was known to come, and the sign becomes meaningless unless it is something which is to take place within a short period of time.

In keeping with the various possible interpretation of הָעַלְמָה are also various interpretations of הָרָה וְיֹלֶדֶת בֵּן . Following Duhm's exegesis, 7:14 merely means that the threat of the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition will so soon pass away that young women bearing sons will call them, Immanuel. The sign is similar to that given to Moses in Exodus 3:12. It is not a guarantee of the collapse of the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition, but merely a statement that through his lack of belief Ahaz is bringing judgment upon himself. Duhm fails to take into consideration the fact that the child is to be born previous to the breakdown of the coalition. Identifying the almah as a member of the royal harem, Hezekiah has been declared to be Immanuel.[2] Such an interpretation is pure conjecture for there is no reference anywhere to Hezekiah, or any other child for that matter, ever having been called, Immanuel. The same criticism holds for identifying Immanuel as a son of the prophet. The only possible

---

1. עַלְמָה, a young woman of marriageable age who has not borne children. There is a possibility that it may refer to a second wife of Isaiah, but this interpretation is forced.

2. Fullerton AJSL. Vol. 34. P. 26ff. Meinhold, Der Heilige Rest. P. 116. Holshcer, Die Propheten P. 229f. Micklem Op. Cit. P. 151.

argument in favor of this theory is that Isaiah gave his children symbolic names, but when a son was born to him, presumably nine months later, the child was given the name, Maher-shalal-hash-baz. Identification of Immanuel with the Messiah has been rejected on the ground that the whole import of Isaiah's sign is a warning to Ahaz of the dangers of alliance with Assyria. There is nothing in 7:14 or in that which follows to suggest that Immanuel is to play any part in ushering in the Messianic era.[1]

The failure of all other attempts to explain satisfactorily the Almah-Immanuel sign have led some scholars to turn to the field of mythology for an explanation. Gressmann thinks that Almah was a general mythological figure.[2] Kittel contends that the Almah is someone regarded as extra-ordinarily important, and identifies her with the Hellenistic mystery religions.[3] Mowinckel argues that Immanuel is a cultic word which the prophet used ironically.[4] The accuracy of such an intertretation of the passages depends on whether such cult figures were known in Jerusalem in Isaiah's day. As Kraeling has said:

> Manifestly if everyone in Judah knew about a mysterious mother and a redeemer babe the work of Isaiah would have sounded much less peculiar to Ahaz than they do to us today who find it very odd that the prophet should hit upon the idea of a conception

---

1. Verses 22 has sometimes been offered as suggesting prosperity but this interpretation can only be given when the verse is taken out of the context.

2. Der Messias P. 235.

3. Op. Cit. P.6f.

4. Psalmenstudien. Vol 2. P. 306.

birth and naming of a babe as a sign for Ahaz.[1]

That a cultic person by the name of עלמה was possibly known in Jerusalem is suggested by the use of this work in three other places in the Old Testament. In Psalm 68:26 and Song of Songs 1:3 and 6:8 the word may be used in a technical sense.[2] The word also occurs four places in the Ras Shamra mythological texts. In poem C, lines 42 and 49, it occurs in the phrase, אתת עלמי , and in lines 45 and 46, in the expression עלמי(ם) ל בת . Virolleaud translates the word 'servant.' It is clear from its use here that the Almoth are cult figures. There are two of them and they are addressed as, 'O wives, wife of El and his servant!'[3] The Almoth are really the wives of Mot. El seduces them and they give birth to the twin gods, Shahar and Shalem, the beautiful and gracious god's representing the winter and summer solstices.[4]

In view of the fact that Ahaz had adopted Canaanite cult practices and that the Almoth are seen to be cult figures of the Ras Shamra ritual which is identified with the Canaanite culture pattern, it is logical that Isaiah is making use of a term well known to the king.[5] This

---

1. "The Immanuel Prophecy" JBL. Vol. 50. P. 288.
2. Its use in Gen. 24:43, Ex. 2:8 Prov. 30:19 is clearly non-technical.
3. For the entire poem C, translated into English see Exhibit B. P.ii.
4. Graham and May. Culture and Conscience. P. 307.
5. Graham thinks the LXX translators may have used ἡ παρθένος because they had this identity of the almah in mind. He calls attention to the fact they were Jews and not Christians. AJSL. Vol. 50. P. 215.

theory would be well substantiated if we could find a reference to Immanuel in the Ras Shamra ritual, but unfortunately as yet no such reference has been found. Nevertheless, there is further light to be thrown upon the Almah-Immanuel sign from a consideration of one of these beautiful and gracious gods in the light of an enigmatic statement made by Isaiah in 8:20, אֲשֶׁר אֵין־לוֹ שָׁחַר . Scholars have tried every method to make sense out of this phrase. The Septuagint and Old Latin versions change שָׁחַר to שׁוֹחַד (gratuity), but this offers no help in clearing up the difficulty. Gray says the phrase is hopeless.[1]

A number of different suggestions have been offered, but none seems to tie the phrase satisfactorily into the context.[2] Another mistake of the majority of these translations is pointed out by Mitchell who says of them:

> They are all unsatisfactory. The fundamental error in them is, that in every case the subject of יֹאמְרוּ 'say,' 'tell of,' is supposed to be those from whom Jehovah has withdrawn his favor. Such an interpretation is forbidden by the entire context. In the first place, it detaches the preceding exhortation from that of verse 19, thus destroying a perfect antithesis and weakening the force of the passage; and secondly, it attaches to the subject as a modifier a relative clause, אֲשֶׁר אֵין־לוֹ שָׁחַר , 'to which there is no dawn,' which was evidently not intended to serve any such purpose. Violence of this sort is avoided by making the subject the teaching and testimony. The exhortation to consult them then remains in the mouth of Isaiah, where it belongs, and the relative clause becomes a (needed) description of the character of their contents.[3]

Mitchell's translation of the verse is : "To the teaching and the testimony, surely they tell of the like of this state, to which there is no

---

1. ICC. Isa. P. 159.

2. See Exhibit C. P.

3. Isa. A Study of chapters 1-12 P. 202.

dawn. This makes good sense and fits the verse into the context. The meaning becomes even more clear if we consider לוֹ as referring to the king rather than the state. The translation of the verse would then be, "To the teaching and to the testimony, surely they will say, for him there is no Shahar."

The Hebrew word, שַׁחַר is generally translated as dawn, literally, the first faint promises of the light of day. Considered as a deity representing the winter solstice, it would have the same relationship to the annual cycle as the dawn does to the diurnal. That this is the proper sense of the word as it is used in Isaiah 8:20 is supported by the fact of other similar Old Testament usages. Before the Ras Shamra texts were discovered, Gressmann had advanced the theory that this word in some places in the Old Testament had deity significance.

> Since in Isaiah 14 and Psalm 110 more than a poetic picture seems to exist, the dawn must be a goddess. If elsewhere the speech is of her wings and her eyelashes, even that cannot be held as compelling proof of a mythological figure. But undisputed, authentic proof are the Akkadian personal names of the time of Hammurapi, and a discovery out of Assyria according to which the dawn was still preserved as a deity at Damascus in the time of Shalmanasser III. So one can accept the dawn, as Hilel, for an Ammorite deity whose cult was preserved by the Syrians until a later time.[1]

In the description of the great sea monster in Job 41, his eyelids are said to be "like the eyelids of Shahar" (verse 10). This is the same sea monster mentioned in the Ras Shamra texts, where he is called, Lotan. Psalm 110:3 speaks of "the womb of Shahar," and in Psalm 139:9 Shahar is clearly portrayed as a winged deity. The name, Hilel ben Shahar, of

---

1. Der Messias. P. 37.

Isaiah 14:22 is a subtle allusion to a mythological god. The superscription of Psalm 22 indicates that it was to be used in relation to "the hind of Shahar." Graham and May claim that the first part of this Psalm is an old Canaanite Messianic Psalm used in connection with the birth of Shahar and the revivifying of the earth.

> The superscription of the twenty-second Psalm indicates that it was to be used upon, on account of, or concerning, the hind of Shahar. .....
> .....It will be recalled that the greater, and probably the earlier part of this Psalm deals with the suffering of the Messiah, who has been defeated and discredited and is nigh unto extinction, as life in the earth seemed to be in the long, dark days immediately preceding the passing of the solstice. There is much reason to believe that the earlier parts of the Psalm were originally derived from a liturgy pronounced either during this season or in allusion to this season.[1]

These references are sufficient to show that the Old Testament use of the word carries in some instances the suggestion of a deity known by that name. It seems, then, we are justified in drawing the conclusion that in Isaiah's day, the god, Shahar, was known in Jerusalem, and in the Canaanized Hebrew cult this god represented the return of prosperity (Cf. Hosea's use of the word in 10:15 where he says, "with Shahar shall the king of Israel be cut off.")

We are now in a position to understand the Almah-Immanuel sign. What Isaiah is here doing is making reference to the cultus ceremonial which was engaged in to bring about annual rejuvenation of the king (and ipso facto) his people. Thus the real conflict between Ahaz and Isaiah was religious more than political. The political aspect, however, entered

---

1. Culture and Conscience. P. 98f.

in, for Ahab, feeling the threat of the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition, was turning to Assyria for help, and that gave Isaiah the opportunity to proclaim his message.

It is hardly conceivable that Isaiah believed an Assyrian disaster could be averted. Assyria was coming into the west anyway. Why, then, did he give the sign? He gave it because he believed that faith in Yahweh was essential to the entire meaning of life. Ahaz represented a different philosophy of life. Isaiah gave the sign so that after the disaster was over men might know the inadequacy of that philosophy.

The meaning of the sign, then, is this. The cult ceremonial for the annual rejuvenation of the king will be carried out. The Almah will give birth to the son. Before he is old enough to know what is good to eat, the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition will be broken up. It will look, as though the cult practice is valid. The nation will go on living for awhile just as it is now doing, engaging in its corrupt religious practices. But this cannot endure long. This magic ritual has nothing of worth in it. It will be the power of Assyria alone that will break up the coalition, and this same power will bring devastation upon the land of Judah. Yahweh is bringing to an end the existing world order.

What will happen when the existing world order collapses? In 8:8 Isaiah sarcastically refers to the land of Judah as the land of the cult figure, Immanuel. Immanuel is the rejuvenated king, i. e. Ahaz. In 8:10, in a word play upon this name, the prophet turns to his own disciples. When the destruction takes place, the help of God will come to those who have put their trust in Him, "Speak the word and it shall stand, for with us is God." Isaiah knew that when the hour of crisis came, men would turn

frantically to the magical cult practices for help (8:19ff). Then he and his disciples must be firm in their teaching. Those who continue to look for help from the cult ceremonial will not find it. They will declare of their king that there is no Shahar for him. He will look to heaven and earth, but will find no help. Then he will commit the crime of cursing his god and his king (the king of Assyria!).

Thus Ahaz's career as Yahweh's anointed will come to an end. The end will come because of his lack of faith in Yahweh who is the only true God. In the day of destruction, Yahweh will be with the prophet and his followers because of their trust in him. Having come thus far in his thinking, Isaiah would naturally look beyond the impending disaster. He would begin to think of the new order that would emerge from the period of gloom. Surely the Holy God would provide a ruler with such attributes of character that the new state would be holy. With the idea of Immanuel, a figure of divine origin, in mind, what is more logical than to think Isaiah would decide that the ruler of the new order would be one with divine attributes? Perplexed as to how such a one could be, and with the cult pattern still in mind, it would be easy to conclude that Yahweh would give them such a Wonder-Child.

A study of the name of the child in 9:6 confirms this thesis. The first name, פלא יועץ (Wonder of a counsellor), is in keeping with the thought that Yahweh would restore the "Counsellors of old" (1:26). This we know to have been in Isaiah's thought.[1] The second name, אל גבור (the mighty El), may be sarcasm on Isaiah's part. The

---

1. Cf. Isa. 28:29 where Yahweh is characterized as "wonderful in counsel."

coming Messiah, who is Yahweh's representative, will be truly powerful in contrast to the "El" of the cult ritual who is powerless. Likewise in the third name we may have a reference to the cult ceremonial. The name, עַד אֲבִי, has been problematical. The Hebrew word, עַד, may mean either 'booty' or 'eternity'; אֲבִי means 'father of'. The name then reads, 'father of booty' or 'father of eternity'. In neither case is the meaning clear. The word, אב, occurs in the Ras Shamra text as a term for deity. Montgomery thinks it is the name of a corn deity.[1] In Poem B, column vii, line 43, the name occurs in the phrase, אנ ימלך אב ילכ (I will make Ab king). Here it is an epithet of Aleion, the life-giving deity. Isaiah may have borrowed this word from its popular use in the cult ritual, and may have used it to show that the Messiah alone would be the one who would bring prosperity to the nation, and not the אב of the popular cult. The last name, שַׂר שָׁלוֹם, (prince of peace) may be a play upon words upon the names of the two beautiful and gracious gods, שחר, and שלם.

This study of the Messiah's names confirms the belief that Isaiah's Messianic hope came as an antithesis to the popular cult ceremonial. The Messiah is not one with Immanuel. He is rather contrasted with him. Immanuel's land will be overrun, and he will have to eat curds and honey with the rest, but the Messiah will be Yahweh's agent who will be given to those who trust in Him to give them security.[2]

---

1. JAOS. Vol. 53. P. 122.

2. Cf., Mitchell, Isaiah: A Study of Chapters 1-12. P. 210.

While Isaiah conceived the idea of the Messianic hope as a result of his conflict with Ahaz, he did not utter the oracles until the disaster which he expected was actually taking place. Hezekiah had disappointed the prophet through his lack of faith in Yahweh as shown by his alliance with Egypt. But in 701, when Sennacherib was at the gates of Jerusalem, Isaiah gave the oracle in 9:1-6 and that in 11:1-9 as an apology for his faith in Yahweh.

In 9:1-16 the Messiah comes as a child. In 11;19 he is a נֵצֶר and חֹטֶר (a new shoot). This supports the thesis that Isaiah conceived the idea of his Messianic hope as an antithesis to the cult ceremonial in which a new-born child became the deliverer. It is significant that in exilic and post exilic literature the Messiah appears as a mature figure.

The third Messianic passage, 32:1-5, generally attributed to the prophet has only the thought that a king will rule in righteousness. He may be a perfectly human king. This oracle was probably delivered after the deliverance from Assyria, and after the reforms of Hezekiah. There are good grounds for believing that Hezekiah's reforms may be an expression of a new loyalty on his part toward Yahweh. This may have come because of his gratitude to Yahweh for the deliverance of the city. In this signal deliverance the king saw Isaiah's faith in Yahweh vindicated and became a devout worshipper of him. It is possible that as a result of this, the prophet saw the possibility of the attainment of his Messianic ideal through a human king.

CHAPTER VI THE MESSIANIC HOPE IN THE SECOND ISAIAH

In this chapter we shall deal with the Messianic hope in the Second Isaiah and related prophecy. The question of the unity of Isaiah 40-55 lies beyond the scope of this dissertation. It may be said that a majority of scholars claim some kind of unity for this section of the book, either as the work of a single author or a school of related authors.[1] The contents of this section certainly have a unity of spirit and outlook that justifies our speaking of them as the Second Isaiah. Moreover, chapters 60-62 are so like 40-55 in content that for the purpose of our investigation we may consider them together with 40-55.

The date of this section of the prophecy is easily fixed if the book is held to be a unity. Chapters 40-48 clearly reflect the period just before 538. The situation is in Babylon. Cyrus is about to overthrow the reigning house of Babylonia, and the author regards this as an omen that the Jews will soon be allowed to return to Jerusalem. There are references in 49-55[2] that would seem to indicate that the writer is in Jerusalem, but the situation reflected is still before the restoration of the city. We shall not be far afield if we date the section of the prophecy we are to study in these chapters between the

---

1. Cheyne and Kennett are against unity. Duhm, Kittel, Kosters, Sellin, Cornill, Skinner and Whitehouse for unity. Skinner offers an able argument for unity in the Cambridge Bible. Isa. 40-66. P. xv f.

2. 49:14; 51:3,11; 52:1,7 ff.

years 540 and 520. For the most part critical scholarship accepts this dating, although this has not gone unchallenged. Kennett ascribes 49-55 together with 56-66 to the second century on the grounds that the contents answer best to the Maccabean period.[1] Torrey regards 34-35 plus 40-66 a unit and dates it ca. 400.[2] As for Kennett's view we may say that 56-66 may be considered to fit many situations between the end of the sixth and the middle of the second centuries, while 49-55 seems a logical conclusion of 40-48. Torrey's view is made possible only by the deletion of the references to Cyrus (44:28, 45:1). This is easily done. But the coloring of 40-48 which is definitely Babylonian is not so easily removed.[3] The whole burden of these chapters, moreover, is that a return to the homeland is about to take place. In the light of these facts this view, ingenious as it is, can hardly be sustained.

In accepting this date we are not denying the possibility that some of the poems may be later. The date of the so-called Servant Songs[4] has been widely questioned. Budde is emphatic in assigning them to Second Isaiah himself, claiming that there is nothing in the language, contents or metre against such authorship.[5] Cheyne[6] and

---

1. Composition of the Book of Isaiah.
2. Second Isaiah. P. 107.
3. Note the reference to the Babylonian gods in 46:1.
4. Generally regarded as 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12.
5. "The So-Called Ebed-Yahweh Songs." AJT. Vol. 3. P. 535 ff.
6. The Introduction to the Book of Isaiah. P. 273.

Marti[1] both favor the acceptance of the songs as authentic. Duhm first held to a date earlier than the prophet, but later abandoned that view in favor of the belief that they came from a later hand.[2] Whitehouse says they were written before the prophet's time, and inserted by him in the prophecy.[3] G. A. Smith accepts the first three but regards 52:13-53:12 as a later insertion.[4] Levy thinks they are later than the rest of the prophecy.[5] Kennett ascribes them all to the Maccabean period.[6] Skinner prefers to leave the question unsettled.[7] Knudson finds them necessary to the thought of the rest of the book.[8] Inasmuch as no sufficient argument has been advanced to show the poems are not an integral part of the book, we are justified in accepting the same date for them.

There are three places in the Second Isaiah in which the Messianic hope is possibly stated. The first is the reference to Cyrus as Yahweh's anointed (45:1); the second has to do with the identification of the servant of the Servant Song; while the third is found in the 'sure mercies of David' passage (55:3b-4).

---

1. Jesaja. P. 371.
2. Kommentar. P. 247.
3. NCB. Isa. 40-66. P. 18f.
4. HBD. P. 494.
5. The climax of the prophet's thought, written by him and inserted in the prophecy in his old age. Deutro-Isaiah P. 14.
6. Composition of the Book of Isaiah P. 72.
7. CB. Isaiah 40-66. P. xlvii f.
8. Beacon Lights of Prophecy. P. 209f.

In 45:1 occurs the expression, "Thus says Yahweh to his Anointed, to Cyrus," thus putting Cyrus in apposition with 'His Anointed' On the face of it this seems to give Messianic significance to Cyrus. In favor of such an interpretation are three arguments. (1) Cyrus is definitely called, 'His Anointed' in the text. (2) In the other verse that refers to Cyrus, 44:28, Yahweh addresses him as, 'My Shepherd.'[1] David is also called Yahweh's shepherd (II Samuel 5:2), and Jeremiah 30: 9 and Ezekiel 34:23f each refers to the Messiah as David. (3) Cyrus in making possible the return to the homeland is to a certain extent doing the work of the Messiah. Three arguments may also be offered against such an interpretation. (1) The ideal king is nowhere else addressed as, "Messiah," unless it be in Psalm 2:2 where the reference is probably merely to the king of Israel. (2) In other eastern lands the king was called the Shepherd of the god. Such may have been the practice in Babylon.[2] (3) It is hard to believe that the author could give Messianic significance to a gentile.

Just what the prophet meant to imply by speaking of Cyrus as Yahweh's Anointed it may be impossible to understand fully. Cheyne says the Jews expected Cyrus to set up an independent Israelitish empire.[3] Skinner thinks there is nothing more here than the idea that Yahweh has ordained Cyrus to be His agent and representative, and says

---

1. Marti changes the pointing of the MT to make רֹעִי read רֵעִי but there is no need or justification for this.

2. Whitehouse. NCB. Isa. Vol. 2. P. 117.

3. Prophecies of Isa. P. 292.

that "the idea that the role of the Messianic king is by the prophet transferred to Cyrus is not be be entertained."[1]. Levy claims the reference merely shows the importance of Cyrus in the eyes of the prophet.[2] Marti denies that the prophet thought of Cyrus as the Messiah, but at the same time he practically gives him Messianic significance. He says:

> Cyrus is here called the Anointed, the Messiah of Yahweh, i.e., the one consecrated by Yahweh to be His delegate and substitute. The thought of a Messiah in the sense of the Christian Christ is very distant, but as one who as the anointed king stands especially near to Yahweh as his deputy and the executor of his Lord's will, Cyrus is here the faithful one and protégé in a special sense.[3]

Torrey is insistent that 45:1 refers to the Messiah and not in any sense to Cyrus.[4]

The account of Cyrus' relationship to Marduk, recorded on a clay cylinder from the king's own time, is worthy of notice. The relationship is practically the same as that which exists here between Yahweh and Cyrus.[5] Moreover, certain phrases are the same in both documents, e.g. 'whose hand I have held' and 'called thee by name.' In this cylinder Cyrus is called the deliverer of the oppressed people and the chosen of Marduk. He is hailed as a saviour. He claims to have restored the temples and houses of the gods in the neighborhood

---

1. CB. Isa. Vol. 2. P. 64.

2. Deutero-Isa. P. 183.

3. Jesaja. P. 460.

4. Second Isa. P. 357.

5. CAH. Vol. 4 P. 13. Cf. Vol. 3. P. 410.

of Babylon.

Gressmann contends that this similarity between the wording of the Cyrus cylinder shows that Second Isaiah has borrowed the Babylonian court style. He has merely substituted the name of Yahweh in the place of Marduk.[1] This seems a reasonable explanation, for then the prophet would be doing in the case of Cyrus exactly what he does in the case of the Babylonian gods.[2] The application of the title, רֹעִי, to him may be irony on the part of the prophet. Inasmuch as Cyrus is to do nothing more than make possible the return to the homeland, and in view of the fact that he was regarded in Babylon as Marduk's favored one which would naturally have led the prophet to speak of him ironically, we may conclude there is little basis for thinking the Second Isaiah considered Cyrus the Messiah.

The problem of the Messianic significance of the Servant of Yahweh is not so easily solved as that of Cyrus. The problem is a difficult one due to lack of information as to who this Servant was. McFayden maintains that "strictly speaking the figure is not in the Messianic succession at all."[3] On the other hand, Knudson says:

> On petty etymological grounds it has been argued that the Servant was not the Messiah and that he sustained no relation to Israel's Messianic hope. But with objections of this kind we need not concern ourselves. Nor is it a matter of any special importance whether the Servant be understood in an individual or collective sense. It suffices for our present purpose that he was regarded as the agent through whom the divine salvation was to be wrought

---

1. Der Urspring der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie. P. 305.

2. 46:1ff.

3. ABC. P. 184.

> in the world. And in the picture we have presented of him we have the sublime thought that the redemption of men was not to be effected by the exercise of force, but by vicarious suffering.[1]

Knudson, however, is here thinking of the Messianic hope in its broader sense. According to the definition we have accepted for this dissertation, we can regard the Servant of Yahweh as the Messiah only if it can be shown that he is an individual who does the work the Messiah is supposed to do.

The tendency in recent years has been to identify the Servant with Israel.[2] Some scholars have held to the theory that he represents not the real but the ideal Israel.[3] Others think he stands for the pious kernel within Israel.[4] The idea of the actual Israel regarded from the ideal point of view has also been suggested. [5] Still another suggestion is that the Servant represents some specific group within Israel, such, for example, as the teachers of the law.[6]

The following arguments may be considered in favor of identifying the Servant with Israel. (1) Outside of the Servant Songs the Servant is clearly seen to be identified with Israel. (2) In 49:3 he is called Israel, and in the Septuagint version of 42:1, he is addressed as Jacob.

---

1. Religious Teachings of the Old Testament. P. 375.
2. Giesebrecht. Wellhausen, Stade, Cornill, Marti, Budde and others.
3. Davidson, Driver, Kirkpatrick, Skinner and Levy.
4. Whitehouse, Knobel, Bleek, and, to a certain extent, Duhm.
5. Peake.
6. Duhm. Cheyne also accepted this view shortly before his death. He had previously held to the identification with Israel.

(3) The author would have had prophetic precedent for so personifying Israel.[1] Against such an identification, however, other arguments can be advanced. (1) In 49:1-6 and in 50:4-9 the Servant speaks. In both instances the words sound like those of one speaking out of his own experience. The Servant feels he has labored in vain, yet somehow is sure he will receive the recompense due him (49:4). He has suffered willingly, knowing that Yahweh will bless him for it (50: 6-9). (2) Some statements of the Servant Songs clearly differentiate the Servant from Israel. He is to be a 'covenant to the people' (42:6. 49:6). He is suffering for the sins of Israel (53:8), and he is to redeem Israel (49:6). (3) The fact that the Septuagint version of 42:1 identifies the Servant with Jacob can be explained by saying that when this version was made the translators thought the Servant meant Israel. They therefore inserted the word, Jacob, that the identity of the Servant might be made known. In the same manner the 'Israel' of 49:3 may be explained as a gloss. (4) In other parts of the prophecy the servant, Israel, is sinful, but the Servant of the Songs is sinless.

The arguments against identification of the Servant with Israel more than outweigh those in favor of such identification. If the Servant was an individual he may have been regarded by the author of these songs as the Messiah. It is necessary, therefore, for us to give consideration to the various individualistic identifications of the Servant.

---

1. Amos 5:2. Hos. 11:1.

The Servant has been identified as Jeremiah.[1] The reason for such an identification was found in the suffering which the Servant endured as shown in 50:4-9 and 52:13-53:12. In the light of the persecutions of Jeremiah it was easy to make this identification. Such an identification, however, fails to solve the problem for in all except the last poem the Servant is still living.

The Servant has been identified as Zerubbabel. This theory was suggested by Sellin.[2] He felt that the language of the poems pointed unmistakably to a king or ruler. Only a person of such position could have had the international significance assigned to the Servant. It is a fact that Zerubbabel disappears from history very strangely soon after his return to Jerusalem as a leader of the returning exiles. We know that Haggai and Zechariah hoped that he would be the Messiah. The suggestion made by Sellin is that Zerubbabel attempted to fulfill the role of the Messianic king and as a result was put to death by the Persian authorities.

Inasmuch as Zerubbabel was identified by Haggai and Zechariah as the Messiah and the Spirit of Yahweh rested both upon him and upon the Servant (Zechariah 4:6,14. Haggai 2:4,5. Isaiah 42:1), Sellin's identification does merit recognition. Against acceptance of the theory is the fact that nothing beyond the Haggai-Zechariah references is known of what happened to Zerubbabel in Jerusalem. Sellin himself

---

1. Suggested by Duhm in his Theologie. Later given up by him. In his Kommentar he identifies the Servant with the Torah-Lehrer.

2. Serubbabel. 1898.

in a few years came to regard the theory as untenable and abandoned it.

The Servant has been identified as Jehoiachin.[1] Little is known of what happened to Jehoiachin after his release from prison in 561 by Evil-Merodach. Sellin who advanced the theory that the Servant was Jehoiachin argued that his release after thirty-six years of imprisonment awakened in the minds of the exiles a great hope. They saw before them a decisive change in their fortunes. They believed Jehoiachin would lead them back home and become their king. His reign would be the glorious reign of the Messianic kingdom, and his exaltation would be converted to a belief in Him. Inspired by this belief, the Second Isaiah, then a young man, wrote the Servant Songs. Jehoiachin died before he had accomplished what the Second Isaiah hoped he would. Then Cyrus came upon the scene and the prophet's hopes were revived. He wrote the body of the prophecy and incorporated the Servant Songs in it, transferring the identification of the Servant from Jehoiachin.

The Servant has been identified as Moses. This identification was made by Füllkrug in 1899. The view was held also by Hontheim and Fischer, and was finally accepted by Sellin who had given up the Jehoiachin identification.[2] Some commendable arguments were advanced in favor of the Moses identification. References were found in the prophecy to the Exodus (43:2. 50:2-3). The Servant is thought by many

---

1. By Sellin in Studien, 1901, and again in, The Enigma of The Book of the Second Isaiah, in 1908.

2. Mose. P. 3f. 96.

to have been a victim of leprosy and Exodus 4:6 contains an account of Moses having been stricken by this disease. Furthermore, Moses was a truly great figure of Hebrew history. In this respect he better fitted the rôle of the Servant than either Zerubbabel or Jehoiachin.

The same argument offered against identifying the Servant with Jeremiah may be offered against the identification of him with Moses. In the first three poems the Servant is still living. Moreover, nothing is known about the death of Moses that will substantiate the theory that he died a martyr's death. If this identification could be proved, we could say at once that the Servant is not the Messiah. The data that may be offered in support of this theory, however, is hardly sufficient to be given much weight. Sellin, himself, felt this and gave up the view.[1]

The Servant has been identified as a mythological figure. This theory is offered by Gressmann in support of his thesis that Israel received the Messianic hope from a borrowed eschatology.[2] He claims that the use of the word, עֶבֶד, in these songs is in a technical sense which clearly shows that it has been taken over by the prophet from an outside source and is not his own creation. Gressmann argues that the Servant is neither Israel nor any of the many identifications which have been offered. None of these explanations answers the description of the Servant which the poems give.

> So one may call the Servant of Yahweh the ideal of the prophet. Perhaps various characters of history have answered to the pattern. One thinks first of Second Isaiah himself. Like the Servant of

---

1. Einleiting In Das Alte Testament. 1933.

2. Der Messias. P. 308ff.

> Yahweh, he has led his people upon the pathway of repentance. Like that one he has also judged Israel as a sinful, degenerate people, deserving punishment. Like that one he, nevertheless, hoped for the conversion of Israel. Yes, he hoped for the extension of Israel's religion to all people. We never hear of the sorrow and mis-treatment of Second Isaiah, but we do know how strong was the opposition he found in his contemporaries. Even though he himself had undergone no evil experience, yet he knew it in another, namely, in Jeremiah, whose type of soliloquy he had taken over. The heroic figure of Jeremiah could have appeared to him in a special sense as the ideal prophet, but the riddle of the Servant of Yahweh is not thereby cleared up. Neither according to the collective theory could the Servant of Yahweh have arisen in Israel..... Both hypotheses break down in the respect that they have not cleared up the mystery of the suffering and death of the innocent martyr.[1]

If we had only the two songs, 50:49 and 52:13-53:12, to consider, Gressmann's view would bear much more weight. The vicarious suffering of the Servant (53:4,5,7), certainly suggests the pattern of the Tammuz-Ishtar cult. (Similarly it suggests the Anath-Mot-Aleion pattern of the Ras Shamra epic). Even the suffering of the Servant in 50:5-6 sounds more like actual suffering on the part of the speaker than of any cult ritual. And there is nothing in the first two poems to suggest a cult figure. To be sure, Gressmann's argument is that this is mythological material taken over by the prophet and made to serve a new purpose, and in the light of that fact, his theory might be accepted, but even that does not solve the problem of the identity of the Servant. If the prophet did make use of mythological material, he must have had some individual in mind whom he was characterizing by the use of this material. Our problem is merely shifted to finding out to whom the material was thus applied. Thus we travel around in a circle and arrive at exactly

---

1. Der Messias. P. 319.

the same point from which we started. Gressmann fails to see this problem, for the prophet has merely accepted this mythological person as the eschatological figure whom Yahweh would use to restore His people and cause His light to shine to the ends of the earth. Gunkel, who at first shared this view with Gressmann, saw its weakness and gave it up, but Gressmann defended it till the end of his life.

The Servant has been identified as Meshullam, the son of Zerubbabel. This identification was made by Palache.[1] He argues that to suppose the Servant is anonymous is a mistake. The name of the Servant is given in 42:19. The word, מְשֻׁלָּם, in this verse has been regarded as a participial noun by most scholars, though a change of pointing has been found necessary before it could be so translated.[2] The word is used twenty-five other times in the Old Testament, and is always a proper name.

Palache is able through emendations of the text to find this name a number of times in Second Isaiah.[3] This Meshullam is the one mentioned in I Chronicles 3:19. Palache's theory is that Zerubbabel was recalled to Babylon, but that this son received permission to stay in Jerusalem. A passage is found in the Seder ʿŌlām Zūta to support this thesis. It says that in the eighteenth year of the reign of the Persians, Ezra, the scribe, went to Jerusalem, rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem, and organ-

---

1. The Ebed-Yahweh Enigma in Pseudo Isaiah (1934).

2. Rashi translated: "He who has found retaliation of his sins by his suffering". Ibn Ezra: "The righteous one". Kimchi: "The perfect one". Cheyne: "The surrendered one". Volz deletes the word.

3. In 44:26 from מְשַׁלֵּם, and in 44:28 from מְשַׁלֵּם.
In 49:7 from מְשֻׁלָּם. In 52:5 from מְשֻׁלָּם.

ized the temple. Then Zerubbabel returned to Babylon and died there, and his son, Meshullam reigned in his stead.

The name, יִשְׂרָאֵל, was changed in every place in the text except 42:19 where it was retained by an oversight. In 42:1 the name was changed to Jacob and in 49:3 to Israel. The reason for this change was the reaction against the House of David because of the sympathy of that House with the Hellenizing party.

This theory is certainly interesting and Palache offers a well worked out argument in support of it. It can hardly be accepted as a solution of the identity of the Servant, though, unless more data can be produced to show that Meshullam, the son of Zerubbabel actually did suffer punishment and possibly martyrdom in Jerusalem for the sake of the Jews. Palache himself admits that at present his suggestion must remain only a theory.[1]

The Servant has been identified as Second Isaiah himself.[2] The data offered in support of this identification seems more convincing than that of any other theory. In view of this we shall consider here the arguments in favor of such an identification.[3]

There are expressions in the songs which show that the Servant is a prophet. He is to pronounce judgment (42:1). He has the tongue of those who are taught (50:4). He has revealed the arm of Yahweh (at

---

1. Op. Cit. P. 43.

2. Mowinckel (Der Knecht Jahwas. 1921) Gunkel (Ein Vorläufer Jesu. 1921). Sellin (Einleitung In Das Alte Testament. 1933).

3. Worked out independently by the writer.

work in history).[1] One of the main themes of Second Isaiah is that history is showing the fulfillment of prophecy. In other words, he revealed the arm of Yahweh at work. Like the prophet, Jeremiah, he was destined from before birth to do his work.[2] He feels that Yahweh will not let his enemies put him to shame.[3] This is what the prophet, Jeremiah, prayed Yahweh would do for him.[4] In 49:1-6 and 50: 4-9 the Servant speaks in the first person just as Second Isaiah himself does.[5]

The word, עֶבֶד , is used in the prophecy apart from the songs to denote a prophet. It has been argued that elsewhere in the prophecy the word clearly denotes Israel. In 44:26 the use of the word to denote a prophet is clear. Israel as the Servant is also to do the work of a prophet (44:8. 48:20). Thus the author thought of a prophet as a servant of Yahweh. If he had spoken of himself he would probably have used this term.

The great task of the Servant was to take the light to the Gentiles.[6] This is identical with Second Isaiah's great doctrine of universality. Believing as thoroughly as he did in this doctrine, he would naturally feel a great personal responsibility to proclaim it to others besides his own people.

---

1. 53:1.
2. 49:1. Cf. Jer. 1:5. Cf. also Isa. 44:2, 24. 46:3.
3. 50: 8-9.
4. Jer. 17:17f. 20:7,11f.
5. Cf. 40:6. Also the way the Yahwehso often uses 'I'.
6. 49:6.

We have already seen that in the Septuagint version of 42:1 the Servant is called, Jacob, and that in 49:3 he is called Israel. These two terms might be offered as arguments against identifying the Servant with the prophet. That both words are glosses is possible, and the sense is complete without them.[1] The first name is not to be found in the Massoretic text. As for the second, we read in 49:5 that the Servant is to bring back Jacob and gather Israel. If the Servant is Israel, how is this to be? It would be a case of Israel leading Israel, which is meaningless. To say that the Israel, who is to lead, is the purified Israel, or the righteous kernel, necessitates a qualification of the name. There is as much justification in deleting the word altogether as there is in doing this.

Another argument which might be offered against identification of the Servant with the prophet is that history knows nothing of any martyrdom of second Isaiah such as Chapter 53 describes of the Servant. This, however, is an argument ex silentio which can bear little weight. Because we are not told that the prophet suffered a martyr's death is no proof that he did not. Surely one could not preach so pointedly against idolatry in a place where it was practiced as extensively as it was in Babylon without incurring the wrath of a large number of the people. Moreover, the prophet may have given the Jews too great hope of an immediate day of prosperity for them. If so, we may rightly think his contemporaries would turn against him and persecute him.

---

1. The 'Israel' of 49:3 is omitted in Codex xii and one Hebrew Ms. Marti thinks the word should be kept. Few commentators, however, deny that it may be a gloss.

The arguments for identifying the Servant with Second Isaiah may be summarized as follows: (1) The Servant does the work of a prophet, and his message is one of the principal teachings of Second Isaiah. (2) Prophets are called servants.[1] (3) The great task of the prophet was one that Second Isaiah must have felt belonged to him. (4) The reference in the poems to Jacob and Israel may be regarded as glosses. (5) Second Isaiah may have suffered a martyr's death. In the light of these arguments we may conclude that there is strong evidence for regarding Second Isaiah as the Servant.

Could the prophet as the Servant have been regarded as the Messiah? A number of arguments can be presented to show that the mission of the Servant was practically the same as that of the Messiah. Hooke declares that both the Messiah and the Servant belong to the same stream of thought. "Just as the prophet is Yahweh's mouthpiece, so the Anointed One is his agent."[2] With each of them Yahweh enters into moral unity.

The Messiah is spoken of as Yahweh's Servant. Yahweh called David His Servant (II Samuel 7:8), and the Messiah was identified with David's line. In Psalm 89 the Servant and Messiah are identified as one. In verses 50-51 occur the expressions, "Remember, Lord, the scorn of thy Servant[3]..... Wherewith they poured scorn on the footsteps of thy Messiah."[4] Zerubbabel, who was proclaimed the Messiah, was also

---

1. Cf. Am. 3:7. Jer. 7:25.
2. The Old Testament: A Reinterpretation. P. 164.
3. MT has the plural, but Mss. and Sy. have singular.
4. The Messiah is here not only a servant but a 'suffering servant.'

called the Servant (Haggai 2:23).

Yahweh bestows His Spirit upon the Servant (42:1) in the same manner in which it was to be bestowed upon the Messiah. Zerubbabel, as the Messiah, is commanded by Yahweh to fulfill his office "not by might nor by power but by the Spirit"(Zechariah 4:6).

The Servant suffers vicariously. In a late Messianic passage (Zechariah 12:10) the Messiah is one who has been "pierced". The suffering of the Servant in 53:5 is suggestive of the ritual humiliation of the king in the Babylonian New Year festival. In view of the cult ceremonial which suggested to Isaiah the Messianic hope, a ceremonial resembling very much that of the Babylonian festival,[1] the account of the Servant's suffering may be given to show that he was the Messiah.

The Servant does the work of the Messiah. Israel, as a servant, is merely to witness, but the Servant is to gather the released Jews into a new nation (42:1-4). He is equipped with a mouth like a sharp sword (49:2). The Messiah is to "smite the earth with the rod of his mouth" (11:4). Both the Messiah and Servant are to bring justice. The Servant is to have power over kings (49:7, 52:15) which is in line with the exalted position the Messiah is to hold.

The opening verse of chapter 60 is a proclamation that the New Day is about to dawn and is much like the opening of the oracle in 9:1-6. This is certainly a companion piece to 40-55[2], and the subject

---

1. Hooke. The Labyrinth. P. 100.

2. Chapters 60-62 are so much one with 40-55 in spirit that they may well be regarded as the work of the same prophet.

is the coming return from Babylon.

In 61:1 the prophet speaks of himself as one whom Yahweh has anointed. He is to establish joy and righteousness. He performs his work that Yahweh may be glorified, and that men may know the New Age has come.

Aside from the evidence with we have found within the text itself further evidence can be offered to show that the Messianic office was transferred in post-exilic Judaism from that of a king to that of a prophet. In Malachi 4:5 it is the returned Elijah who is to be sent by Yahweh to usher in the New Age. Elijah stood in Judaism as the personification of the prophetic office, and it is easy to see how his name might be used in preference to another's who might have been regarded as the Messiah.

From the evidence before us we may deduce the following arguments in favor of identifying the Servant as the Messiah: (1) The Messiah is called a servant, and both he and the Servant are endowed with the Spirit of Yahweh. (2) Both the Servant and the Messiah suffer vicariously. (3) The Servant and the Messiah fulfill the same type of mission. (4) The prophet speaks of himself as one who has been anointed. (5) We have evidence in Malachi that the prophetic office was exalted to the position which the Messianic office had previously held. From the data before us we may conclude that the Servant was the prophet and that he was regarded as the Messiah.

The oracle contained in 55:3b-5 contains the only direct reference to David in the Second Isaiah. It reads: "I will make an eternal conven-

and with you, the loving-kindness of David made sure. Behold,I give him (to be) a witness to the people, a prince and commander of the people. Behold, you will call a nation that you do not know, and a nation that did not know you will run unto you, because of Yahweh, thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel, for he has glorified you."

Marti thinks that Second Isaiah reaches the climax of his teaching in this verse.

> Second Isaiah collects in the great promise the sum of all his prophecies. Here at the most prominent point of his writing, just before its close, he brings together the two themes, Zion and the Servant of Yahweh. That which is most significant is how this reflects back upon the Servant of Yahweh poems. Israel, the Servant of Yahweh. is the light to the heathen (42:6, 49:6). The heathen people bow down to him and recognizes Yahweh's rulership and wonderful power to help.[1]

Marti denies that the passage is Messianic. He admits that it may be regarded, on the one hand, as a defense of the promise made to David, but, on the other hand, it is just as much in opposition to the Messianic hope.[2] It is merely a statement that the promises made to David are now transferred to Israel.

Whitehouse sees in the passage a revival of the Messianic hope which had died down during the exile, and a reference to the hope already arising that Zerubbabel would be the fulfillment of the old expectation.[3] Levy contends that such an interpretation is untenable.[4] Skinner finds in

---

1. Jesaja. P. 358.
2. Marti holds that Second Isaiah does not know the Messianic hope.
3. NCB. Isa. 40-66. P. 218.
4. Deutero-Isaiah. P. 277.

the passage a transference of the Messiahship from the dynasty to the people,[1] thus concurring in the view of Cheyne who interprets the passage as meaning that for its author the "ideal of personal royalty" had "lost actuality." He believed that "each Israelite is a prince, and the collective church-nation is Jehovah's anointed."[2]

Obviously there can be no reference to a Messianic king in the passage unless it be in 3b-4. But here the verbs are in the past tense, while in verse 5 they are in the imperfect tense. The meaning, then, is that what is recorded in verse 5 will transpire because what is related in verse 4 has already happened.[3] Cheyne and Skinner have read ideas into verse 5 when they say it transfers to Israel the Messianic hope. There is nothing in the verse to show that every Israelite is a prince, or that Israel is Yahweh's anointed. The verse says only that Israel will be glorified because of Yahweh's presence with her.

The importance of this passage so far as our dissertation is concerned is that the Davidic dynasty is no longer found necessary. Thus the way surely would have been opened for regarding the prophet as the Messiah, and the passage supports our thesis that in the Servant of Yahweh we have an expression of the idea that Second Isaiah was the Messiah.

---

1. CB. Isa. 40-66. P. 160.
2. Jewish Religious Life After The Exile. P. 96f.
3. Davidson's Hebrew Grammar. (Revised by McFadyen). P. 157.

CHAPTER VII THE MESSIANIC HOPE IN THE APOCALYPTIC AND SOME OTHER LATE PASSAGES OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

There are a number of passages in the book of Isaiah which are rightly classified as apocalyptic literature. Chapters 24-27 are generally so regarded as well as chapters 34-35. Chapter 35, however, reflects more the spirit and ideas of Second Isaiah than apocalyptic. Other apocalyptic fragments are found throughout the prophecy, e.g., 11:11-16,59. 63:1-6. There are other passages which seem to come from a time later than the material dealt with in the last chapter. Some of this material bears a strong resemblance to apocalyptic literature, though it can hardly be so classified in the strict sense of the word.

Definite dating of these sections of the book is done with great difficulty. Cheyne argues that the situation presented, the ideas expressed, and the style and language of chapters 24-27 all point to a late post-exilic date.[1] Gray accepts the year 400 as an approximate date for these chapters, saying that if the chapters were made later we should expect to find features which are not present therein. He admits, however, that the absence of such features are no proof against a possible later date.[2] The most that we can conclude for the passages we are to study in this chapter is that they represent a type of Old

---

1. Introduction To The Book of Isaiah. P. 147.

2. ICC. Isa. P. 401.

Testament literature that was coming into prominence around the year 400.

There are no apocalyptic passages in the book of Isaiah which speak clearly of the Messiah. Hence, in the light of the definition we have given for Messianic prophecy, we might conclude our study without any further investigation of these passages. However, due to the prominent position the Messiah holds in late apocalyptic literature, we cannot say that the apocalypticists were unacquainted with the Messianic hope. For that reason investigation will be made of these passages to ascertain whether they have any connection with the subject of our dissertation.

It may be said by way of introduction to this subject that the apocalyptic idea of the coming of the Kingdom of God has something in common with the Messianic hope. In both cases the blessings of the New Age are to come after some kind of destruction has taken place. Thus after the people have walked in darkness, they see a great light,[1] and after fire consumes the adversaries of Yahweh, His children will prosper.[2] The shoot is to come forth after the tree of Jesse has been cut down,[3] and the feast in Yahweh's mountain is to take place after the earth has been completely emptied.[4] In the later apocalyptic literature the destruction which precedes the coming of the Kingdom

---

1. Isa. 9:1.

2. Isa. 26:11b-12.

3. Isa. 11:1.

4. Isa. 24:1ff. 25:6.

is called the birth pangs of the Messiah. The tortured earth is to writhe until the Messiah is brought forth.[1] The other points of similarity are to be found in that the apocalyptic Messiah is to be a king who is to bring judgment,[2] and he is to be a saviour of those who love righteousness.[3] Yet while the two types of literature are alike in the prediction of the New Age following calamity, there is nevertheless a marked difference. When the Messiah of late apocalyptic literature appears he comes not to redeem the world as it is, but to completely overthrow the existing order and set up something entirely new, or to rule over the new order which Yahweh has set up.[4]

In 25:6-8 is given a picture of the glorious state of affairs that is to follow Yahweh's great world judgment mentioned in chapter 24 This passage probably originally followed 24:23 from which it has been removed by the insertion of the poem, 25:1-5.[5] The feast is similar to that given at the coronation of a king.[6] There is no mention of a king here and the idea expressed is that Yahweh is now to be the ruler of the whole earth. There is no suggestion anywhere in the apocalypse of human agency helping Yahweh. Yahweh does everything for the Jews (26:12-19). They are to go

---

1. Oesterley and Robinson, Hebrew Rel. P. 354 (footnote), W.F.Lofthouse Robinson's Record and Revelation. P. 470.
2. Psalms of Solomon 17:21,42.
3. Enoch. 48:7.
4. Apocalypse of Ezra 4:36-37.
5. Gray. ICC. Isa. P. 428.
6. Cf. I Sam. 11:15, I Kgs. 1:9f, 25.

into hiding while Yahweh leaves Jerusalem to go throughout the world to perform his judgment (26:20-21. Presumably the purpose of this is that there will be no one to protect them while Yahweh is away.

In the New Age which Yahweh is to bring about the righteous dead will share. This will be made possible by their bodily resurrection (26:19). The unrighteous will not return to enjoy these blessings. For them there will be no resurrection (26:14). Cornill has made the suggestion that the idea of a bodily resurrection, clearly expressed here for the first time in the Old Testament, is the outgrowth of the Messianic hope.[1] Wheeler Robinson has also expressed this belief.[2] It may be that this belief arose because the Jews realized that those of their countrymen of the past who had looked for the Messianic era in their own day had been disappointed. We have already seen that in late apocalyptic literature the world judgment was regarded as the birth pangs preceding the Messiah's birth. In view of this a question arises in regard to 26:18. "We have conceived; we have been in labor. (It is) as though we have given birth to wind. We have not accomplished any salvation in the earth. The inhabitants of the world have not fallen." It is possible that we have in 26:18 an expression of disappointment that the Messiah has not been born. If so, then we have an explanation as to why the personal Messiah is not present here.

Chapter 34 gives us another picture of Yahweh coming to earth to pronounce judgment. This time it is Edom who is judged and punished.

---

1. Prophets of Israel. P. 166.

2. The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament P. 97.

The results of the punishment are given in 63:1-6. In neither of these passages does Yahweh make use of any agency to help him in his work. He has "trodden the winepress alone,"(63:3). Hence we have here essentially the same picture that we have in 24-27; Yahweh, Himself, entering into the affairs of the world, and making no use of a Messiah. Chapter 35 gives a picture of the glory that is to follow the destruction of chapter 34, but there is no justification for calling it a picture of the Messianic era.

In chapter 59 there is a possible Messianic reference, Yahweh is displeased because of the evil in the world. There is no one to pronounce judgment for him so he decides to come to earth himself. Verse 20 reads, "A redeemer will come to Zion, and to those turning from transgression in Jacob." Just who this redeemer is is not made plain. Skinner thinks that the verse refers to Yahweh, and reads, "As a redeemer. But לגואל has no particle before it, and it is better regarded as the subject of יבא. The lack of any information as to who the redeemer is, or what he does, makes it impossible to know just what was in the prophet's mind.

Another late passage that has a possible allusion to a Messianic figure is 11:11-16. If verse 10 can be considered a part of this passage, then the Messianic reference is clear. It is the root of Jesse that is to be a signal for the people, and the root of Jesse is obviously the Messiah. Gray contends that the passage begins at verse 9:1. The contents of verse 9 seems a fitting climax to verses 6-8, and verse 10 appears to be the device of the compiler for uniting verses 11-16 to verse 1-9. The purpose of this uniting verse was to identify the "signal to the nations" with the "shoot from Jesse's root." The most that this shows, then, is

that for the compiler, the "signal" is the Messiah. Whether that was the thought of the author of the poem is uncertain.[1] If so, then here is a conception of the Messiah such as we find in the late apocalypses. The "signal" is not to be active in bringing righteousness and faithfulness as is the Messiah of 11:1-9. He merely serves as a sign to the nations that Yahweh is setting up His kingdom. When this is done, Ephraim and Judah will again be united (verse 13b), and foreign nations will be punished (verse 14).

The poem in chapter 2:2-4[2] is generally regarded as Messianic. There is nothing here, however, that speaks of the Messiah or his work. The poem is a picture of the Last Day. It is Yahweh who will reign in that day upon Mount Zion and bring judgment to the people.

Duhm argues that this poem was written for his disciples in his old age and that it contains "his highest and most sublime ideas." Cheyne thinks that the אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים points away from Isaiah; that the ortatory character of the poem is not suggestive of prophets before Isaiah; and that the absence of metre indicates a late date.[3] Gray thinks it was written near the time of Isaiah 40-55.[4] Box still holds that the

---

1. It is doubtful if it was. נֵס is elsewhere used in the sense of an impersonal object. Cf. Isa. 5:26, 13:2, 18:3.

2. Cf. the companion poem in Micah 4:1-3. The question whether Micah borrowed from Isa. or vice versa has now generally been given up, for the belief that in both prophecies the passage is a late insertion.

3. Introduction to the Books of Isaiah. P. 11ff.

4. ICC. Isaiah P. 43f. Cf. Torrey's argument that Second Isaiah is the author of the Messianic hope.

poem is earlier than the prophet. Marti accepts the approximate date, 500, in keeping with his theory about the Messianic hope.[1] Toy agrees with Marti but thinks the beginning of the Greek period is a possible date.[2] These differences of opinion suggest the difficulty of dating the poem. At present it cannot be said with finality that the poem is late or from the prophet's time or even earlier. The ideas, especially that of instruction going forth from Zion, favor the acceptance of a late date.

The poem is not Messianic for there is no suggestion of Yahweh using any human agency. It is He who rules upon Mount Zion. The Spirit of the poem, however, is that of the Messianic oracles in 9:1-6 and 11:1-9. True religion is extended not by conquest but by moral influence. Yahweh rules not by the sword, but by the word of His mouth, and nations are allowed to keep their independence. War is to cease, for nations that have grievances will bring their cause before Yahweh and He will see that justice is done.

The poem, strictly speaking, is not apocalyptic, though it may have been inspired by the same or a similar situation as that which brought forth apocalyptic literature. H. P. Smith thinks it was and finds this poem to be the connecting link between Messianic and apocalyptic prophecy. He says:

This contrast between the expectation of a divine intervention and

---

1. Jesaja P. 78.

2. Judaism and Christianity P. 313.

> the actual condition of the chosen people is characteristic of Judaism, and the frequent confession of sinfulness which we find in later documents only echoes this prayer. Yet, since we are saved by hope, the post-exilic community continues to cherish the vision of a new heaven and a new earth. One of the best expressions of this hope is in a little paragraph which has been preserved for us both in the book of Isaiah and in the book of Micah. Its post-exilic origin needs no demonstration.....Universal peace, Jerusalem the capital of the earth the law of Yahweh taught to the nations and obeyed by them, such was the Messianic hope in its most spiritual expression. The special relation of Yahweh to Israel is only the first act of a great drama whose denoument will be the spread of true religion to all nations. Israel is Yahweh's messenger, destined to overcome the world, not by the sword but by the word."[1]

Another possible late passage which has been considered to have Messianic significance is 4:2-6. The reason for this is the reference to צֶמַח יְהוָה ,which suggests the Messianic terminology of Jeremiah 23:5. The reference is not to the Branch of David, but to Yahweh's Branch. Gray is probably right in taking צֶמַח יְהוָה to refer to vegetation,[2] i.e. the luxuriant growth which is to take place in the earth after Yahweh's judgment. If there is any reference to a Messiah in this expression, then he is a needless figure, for all the work of bringing about the New Age is done by Yahweh Himself.

In the passages which we have studied in this chapter a clear setting forth of the Messianic hope is conspicuously absent. The evidence indicates that these passages came from a period when a transition was taking place in Hebrew thought relative to the New Age. The Messiah was no longer regarded as a necessary figure. When he emerges again in later apocalyptic literature he has taken on new characteristics. Oesterley brings out the truth of this in his description of Daniel's 'Son of Man'.

---

1. The Religion of Israel. P. 261f.

2. ICC. Isa. P. 76.

> There is here a conception of the Messiah as one who stands first and foremost in the closest possible relationship to God. He comes from above and has pre-existed before the creation of the world. He is represented as a divine nature, and as such worship is offered to him..... in divine human power he will come as judge of both angels and men at the appointed time and will annihilate all the powers of evil.[1]

One reason for the absence of the personal Messiah in these passages may be the same as that which gave rise to apocalyptic literature. The Messianic predictions had not been fulfilled. The Messiahship of Zerubbabel had been a failure. Possibly others had been proclaimed Messiah and had failed to bring prosperity. If these passages are regarded as coming from as late as the Greek period, as Duhm and Marti hold, then we may accept as one reason the reaction against the House of David because of its sympathy with the Hellenizing party.[2] This would have tended to cause a decline of interest in the Messianic hope since the hope had been identified with David's family.

The rising spirit of nationalism that came in the post-exilic period was not favorable to this doctrine. The Jews, who suffered bitterly at the hands of foreign nations, wanted most of all to have these nations punished. Such an attitude was not favorable to the life of a doctrine like that of the Messianic hope.

A further reason for the decline of interest in this hope may be found in the way the Law became the object of glory in post-exilic Judaism. After a period of years interest in the revival of the old

---

1. The Jews and Judaism During The Greek Period. P. 159.

2. Cf. Kennett's view of Simon, the High Priest, as the Messiah.

monarchy was supplanted by an interest in the state church with the power represented by the Law. North says of this

> Even Messianic prophecy became sporadic; and while the extant Messianic oracles may have been cherished, most of the latter eschatological material in the Old Testament shows no expectation of a personal Messiah. The community settled down to worship Yahweh as King, and to keep the manifold precepts of the Law.[1]

The Messianic hope set forth by Isaiah at a time when the nation was threatened, and cherished at the time of the return from exile, has been temporarily abandoned. The Jews now look for Yahweh to redeem them. When the Messiah appears again in later apocalyptic literature, he will be a more supernatural figure than the one we have hitherto known.

---

1. "Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship." ZATW. Vol. 50. P. 19.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Abstract of a
Dissertation

THE MESSIANIC HOPE IN THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

by
Philip Stephen Nason
(A.B., Bates College, 1923; S.T.B., Boston University, 1926)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirement for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

1942

Department: Theological Studies
Field of Specialization: Old Testament
Major Instructor: Professor Elmer A. Leslie

The purpose of the dissertation is to ascertain the origin and development of Israel's Messianic hope as shown in the book of Isaiah. In doing this a survey has been made of the various theories held upon this subject. These have been considered under three headings; those which believe the hope existed previous to Isaiah's day; those which regard Isaiah as the author of this idea; and those which believe the idea did not arise until after Isaiah's time. All of these theories were seen to contain elements of truth, but none seemed an adequate solution of the problem. Evidence shows that a hope similar to the Messianic did exist in ancient countries of the East. Such a hope may be a natural result of Man's spiritual evolution, but there is nothing to show that Israel's Messianic Hope came either from another land or from her own antiquity. A number of passages in the Old Testament which are generally considered to be older than anything in the prophecy of Isaiah have been held to present the Messianic hope. Investigation of these shows that they promise nothing more than the prosperity and perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty. The majority of those who look upon Isaiah as the author of the hope regard it as an outgrowth of his political interest, and fail to take into account that the prophet's primary interest was in religion. The tendency in recent years has been to deny any message of hope to the eighth century prophets, but no adequate arguments have been brought forth to support such a denial. That Isaiah had hope for the future is seen by the oracle in 1:21-26 which is generally regarded as authentic. Those who argue that Isaiah could not have been the author of the Messianic hope do so on inadequate grounds.

A study of the significance of anointing in the Old Testament shows that the king was endowed by this rite with the Spirit of Yahweh. As the anointed one, he became Yahweh's agent to bring peace and prosperity to the nation. Thus the kings served to establish a unique relationship between Yahweh and His people. There are suggestions in the Old Testa - ment that at times the king, under the influence of the Canaanized Yahweh worship, played the part of God in the cult ceremonial. Two approaches are possible to an understanding of the divine nature of the Hebrew king- ship. The first is through a study of the Old Testament historical records; the second through a study of the cult practices that existed in the time of the monarchy. The historical records make no direct statement of king deification, but they do give hints of such practice. These records were extensively revised by the Deuteronomists who were opposed to such a practice, and this may account for the absence of any direct statement. Prohibitions in the Old Testament of certain ritual practices known to have been connected with king deification in other lands indicate at least an attempt at such practice among the Hebrews. Further evidence of king deification is seen in the ritual use made of some of the Psalms, especially in their use in connection with the Feast of the Tabernacles. In Psalm 45:7 the king is definitely addressed as God.

The practice of king deification would have been extremely offensive to such a sensitive soul as Isaiah. His philosophy of life was more religious than political. For him the greatest sin is lack of faith in Yahweh, who is a holy God in whose presence only holy men can stand. If Isaiah were to set forth such a doctrine as that of the Messianic hope, it would very likely be colored by his doctrines of faith and the

holiness of Yahweh. A study of the characters of Ahaz and Hezekiah, the two kings with whom Isaiah had most dealings, shows that neither of them fulfilled the prophet's ideal. Ahaz was especially offensive to the prophet due to his practice of child sacrifice and worship 'under every green tree', both of which were connected with the Canaanite fertility cults. Furthermore, he caused a pagan altar to be erected in the temple. In a time of crisis, Ahaz sought help from Assyria, and this was an admission to Isaiah of the futility of the king's religion. Thus Ahaz failed completely to fulfill the function of Yahweh's Messiah. In the case of Hezekiah, the historical records claim him to have been a virtuous king. There is some evidence to show that he was not always a devout Yahweh worshipper. Furthermore, he was lacking in faith as seen by his trust in the men and horses of Egypt. Hence, Isaiah might have set forth his idea of a Messianic king as an antithesis to either Ahaz or Hezekiah.

The belief that Isaiah is the author of the Messianic hope is further substantiated by a study of the Almah-Immanuel sign of 7:1-17. This passage has offered many difficulties to Old Testament critics, and has usually been interpreted only by deleting a part of it. A new understanding of it is now made possible through recent discoveries made at Ras Shamra. Clay tablets discovered at this place in 1929 and subsequent years have furnished us some of the ritual literature of the fertility cults which existed in Canaan at the time Israel entered that land. This ritual throws new light upon a number of Hebrew religious customs which scholars have thought for some time Israel borrowed

from her Canaanite neighbors. In the Ras Shamra ritual the Almah is a cult figure who becomes the mother of Shahar, the prosperity bringing god. Isaiah declares that there is no Shahar for Ahaz. The significance of the Almah-Immanuel sign is that Ahaz is seeking security through practice of the cult ritual. He hopes in this manner to have God with him (Immanuel), but such will not be the case. Immanuel is not the Messiah, but is the cult figure that represents the rejuvenation of the king. It is this figure that suggests to the prophet his idea of the Wonder-Child, the Messiah. Hence the Messiah is not to be identified with Immanuel but is to be contrasted with him. Isaiah developed his idea of the Messiah from this suggestion and gave utterance to it in the oracles contained in 9:1-6 and 11:1-9 at the time of Sennacherib's assault upon Jerusalem. Another expression of the idea, in a somewhat modified form, is to be found in 32:1-5.

A study was made of the Messianic hope as it is found in Second Isaiah. Chapters 60-63 were studied in this connection since there is found no justification for regarding Isaiah 56-66 as a unit. Investigation was made of three points in this prophecy where the Messianic hope might be expressed. The Cyrus reference in 45:1 is seen to be an ironical appropriation to Yahweh by the prophet of the manner in which Cyrus claimed to be the special agent of the Babylonian god, Marduk. In the study of the Servant Songs an attempt was made to identify the Servant. It is seen that many characters do, in one way or another, answer the description of the Servant, but none fulfills the role as well as does the prophet himself. The question then arises as to

whether he is to be regarded as the Messiah. It is seen that in various ways the Servant and the Messiah are to be identified. Moreover, evidence is found in Malachi to show that in post-exilic time a prophet could be regarded as the agent of Yahweh who would be used to usher in the Messianic era. The conclusion is reached that the Second Isaiah was regarded in some sense as the Messiah. The 'sure mercies of David' passage in 55:3b-5 confirms this thesis for in this we see the idea of the blessings of the Messianic era being transferred from the Davidic dynasty to the people of Israel.

Investigation of the apocalyptic and other late passages contained in the book of Isaiah was made in order to see whether any expression of the Messianic hope is to be found therein. A resemblance was noted between the apocalyptic idea and the Messianic hope. In both cases the blessings of a New Age follow a period of affliction. There is a marked difference, however, in the way in which the New Age is to be established. In the passages studied in this connection, it is Yahweh Himself who brings into existence the Glorious Future. No use is made of the Messiah. Hence there is to be found in these passages no clear setting forth of the Messianic hope, though suggestions of it are seen to be present. The conclusion reached was that a decline in interest in this doctrine had taken place. A possible reason for this was found in the fact that the hope had never been fulfilled, the one attempt at fulfillment on the part of Zerubbabel probably being a failure. The narrow nationalism of post-exilic Judaism was seen to be unfavorable to the life of this doctrine. A possible reaction to the House of David, due to its interest in the Hellenizing party, may also have been a contributing factor to this decline.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

COMMENTARIES ON ISAIAH

Box, G. H.
The Book Of Isaiah.
Macmillan. New York. 1909.

Cheyne, T. K.
Critical Notes On The Text Of Isaiah.
A. & C. Black. London. 1903.
Introduction To The Book Of Isaiah.
A. & C. Black. London. 1895.
The Book Of Isaiah.
Macmillan. London. 1870.
The Prophecies Of Isaiah.
Kegan Paul & Co. London. 1870

Condamin, A.
Le Livre D'Isaie.
Librarie Victor Lecouffre. Paris. 1905

Dillmann, A.
Der Prophet Jesaja.
Leipzig. 1890.

Duhm, B.
Das Buch Jesaja ubersetz und erklart.
Third edition. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. Göttingen. 1914.

Giesebrecht, F.
Beiträge zur Jesajakritik.
Göttingen. 1890.

Gray, G. B.
Isaiah. (Chapters 1-27).
In ICC. Scribner's. New York. 1912.

Kennett, R. H.
Composition Of The Book Of Isaiah.
For the British Academy by H. Frowde. 1910.

Marti, K.
Das Buch Jesaja erklart.
Tübingen. 1900.

Mitchell, H. G.
Isaiah: A Study Of Chapters 1-12.
Crowell & Co. New York. 1897.

Rogers, R. W.
Isaiah. In ABC. Pp. 628-676.
Abingdon Press. New York. 1929.

Skinner, J.
The Book Of The Prophet Isaiah. Two volumes in CB.
The Universoty Press. Cambridge. Revised edition. 1915.

Wade, G. W.
The Book Of The Prophet Isaiah.
Gorham. New York. Undated.

Whitehouse, O. C.
Isaiah. Two volumes in NCB.
Edinburgh. 1905.

WORKS ON HEBREW RELIGION

HAVING SECTIONS DEALING WITH THE MESSIANIC HOPE

Budde, K.
The Religion Of Israel To The Exile.
G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York. 1899.

Cheyne, T. K.
Jewish Religious Life After The Exile.
G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York. 1898.

Houghton, L. S.
Hebrew Life And Thought.
University of Chicago Press. 1906.

Kautzsch, E.
The Religion Of Israel. In HDB. Extra volume. Pp. 612-732.
Scribner's. New York. 1919.

Kittel, R.
Die hellenistische Mysterienreligion und das Alte Testament.
Kohlhammer. Berlin. 1924
The Scientific Study Of The Old Testament.
Translated from, Die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
By J. C. Hughes. G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York. 1910.

Knudson, A. C.
The Religious Teaching Of The Old Testament.
The Abingdon Press. New York. 1918.

Meinhold, J.
Studien zur israelitischen Religionsgeschichte.
Bonn. 1903.

Oesterley, W. O. E. and Robinson, T. H.
Hebrew Religion.
Macmillan. New York. 1930.

Peters, J. P.
The Religion Of The Hebrews.
Ginn & Co. Boston. 1914.

Sellin, E.
Israelitisch-jüdische Religionsgeschichte.
Quelle & Meyer. Leipzig. 1933.

Smith, H. P.
The Religion Of Israel.
Scribner's. New York. 1914.

Smith, W. R.
Lectures On The Religion Of The Semites. Third edition.
A. & C. Black. London. 1927.

Stade, B.
Geschichte des Volkes Israel.
Grote. Berlin. 1887-88.

Welch, A. C.
The Religion Of Israel Under The Kingdom.
T. & T. Clark. Edinburgh. 1912.

Wellhausen, J.
Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte. Fifth edition.
Berlin. 1904.
Prolegomena. Translated from Prolegomena zur Geschichte
Israels. By J. S. Black and A. Munzies.
Edinburgh. 1885.

WORKS ON PROPHECY HAVING REFERENCES TO THE MESSIANIC HOPE

Cornill, K. H.
The Prophets Of Israel.
Translated from, Der israelitischer Prophetismus,
by S. F. Corkian. Third edition.
Open Court. Chicago. 1897.

Duhm, B.
Die Theologie der Propheten. Third edition.
Bonn. 1875.
Israels Propheten.
Mohr. Tübingen. 1916.

Edghill, E. A.
Enquiry Into The Evidential Values Of Prophecy.
Macmillan. New York. 1906.

Graham, W. C.
The Prophets And Israel's Culture.
The University Of Chicago Press. Chicago. 1934.

Hölscher, G.
Die Profeten.
Hinrich's. Leipzig. 1914.

Knudson, A. C.
The Beacon Lights Of Prophecy.
The Abingdon Press. New York. 1914.

Leslie, E. A.
The Prophets Tell Their Own Story.
The Abingdon Press. New York. 1939.

Lods, A.
The Prophets And The Rise Of Judaism.
Translated from, Les Prophètes et le débuts du Judaïsme,
by S. H. Hooke. E. P. Dutton. New York. 1937.

Procksch, O.
Geschichtsbetrachtung und geschichtliche überlieferung bei
den vorexilischen Propheten. Leipzig. 1902.

Sellin, E.
Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus.
Deichert. Leipzig. 1912.

Smith, W. R.
The Prophets Of Israel. Second edition.
A. & C. Black. London. 1895.

Volz, P.
Die Jahweprophetie und der Messias.
Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. Gottingen. 1897.

WORKS ON THE MESSIANIC HOPE.

Ackerman, H. C.
The Immanuel Sign And Its Meaning.
AJSL. Vol. 35. Pp. 205-214.

Aytoun, W. R.
The Rise And Fall Of The Messianic Hope In The Sixth Century.
JBL. Vol. 39. Pp. 24-43.

Berry, G. R.
Messianic Predictions.
JBL. Vol. 45. Pp. 232-237.

Briggs, C. A.
Messianic Prophecy.
Scribner's. New York. 1886.

Buber, M.
Königtum Gottes.
Schocken. Berlin. 1936.

Corley, D. H.
Messianic Prophecies In The First Isaiah.
AJSL. Vol. 39. Pp. 220-224.

Dahl, G.
The Messianic Expectation In The Psalter.
JBL. Vol. 57. Pp. 1-12.

Delitzsch, F.
Messianische Weissagungen in Geschichtlichen Folge.
Leipzig. 1890.

Dürr, L.
Ursprung und Aufbau der israelitisch-jüdischen Heilandserwartung. Berlin. 1925.

Edersheim, A.
Prophecy And History In Relation To The Messiah.
Randolph & Co. New York. 1885.

Edwards, C.
The Messianic Idea.
Watts. London. 1927.

Fullerton, K.
Immanuel.
JBL. Vol. 34. Pp. 256-283.
Viewpoints In The Discussion Of Isaiah's Hope For The Future.
JBL. Vol. 41. Pp. 1-101.

Goodspeed, G. S.
Israel's Messianic Hope.
Macmillan. New York. 1900.

Graham, W. C.
Isaiah's Part In The Syro-Ephraimitic Crisis.
AJSL. Vol. 50. Pp. 211-213.

Gressmann, H.
Der Messias.
Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. Göttingen. 1929.
Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie.
Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. Göttingen. 1905.
The Forming Of Israel's Messianic Hope.
AJT. Vol. 17. Pp. 173-194.

Gunkel, H.
Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit.
Göttingen. 1895.

Guthe, H.
Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaja.
Leipzig. 1885.

Hackmann, H.
Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaja.
Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. Gottingen. 1893.

Kennett, R. H.
The Origin And Development Of The Messianic Hope.
In, Old Testament Essays. Cambridge University Press. 1928.

König, E.
Die Messianischen Weissagungen des Alten Testaments vergleichend, geschichtlich und exegetisch behandelt.
Stuttgart. Berlin. 1923.

Kraeling, E. G.
The Immanuel Prophecy.
JBL. Vol. 50. Pp. 277 ff.

McFadyen, J. E.
Israel's Messianic Hope.
In ABC. Pp. 177-186.

Micklem, N.
Prophecy And Eschatology.
Allen & Unwin. London. 1926.

Oesterley, W. O. E.
The Evolution Of The Messianic Idea.
Pitman & Sons. London. 1908.

Schmidt, H.
Der Mythos vom wiederkehrenden König.
Töpelmann. Giessen. 1925.

Sellin, E.
Die israelitisch-jüdische Heilandserwartung.
Runge. Berlin. 1909.

Smith, H. P.
The Origin Of The Messianic Hope In Israel.
AJT. Vol. 14. Pp. 337-360.

Smith, L. P.
The Messianic Ideal Of Isaiah.
JBL. Vol. 36. Pp. 158-212.

Torrey, C. C.
Outcropping Of The Jewish Messianic Hope.
In S. J. Case's, Studies In Early Christianity.
The Century Company. New York. 1928.

WORKS ON " THE SERVANT OF YAHWEH"

Budde, K.
The So-Called "Ebed Yahweh" Songs.
AJT. Vol. 3. Pp. 499-540.

Eissfeldt, O.
Der Gottes knecht bei Deutero-Jesaja.
Niemeyer. Halle. 1933.

Giesebrecht, F.
Der Knecht Jahwas des Deutero-Jesaja.
Thomas & Oppermann. Königsberg. 1902.

Gunkel, H.
Ein Vorläufer Jesu.
Seldwyla. Bern. 1921.

Laue, L.
Die Ebed-Jahwe Lieder in II Theil des Jesaja.
Stuttgart. Berlin. 1898.

Mowinckel, S.
Der Knecht Jahwäs.
Töpelmann. Giessen. 1921.

Palache, J. L.
The Ebed-Yahweh Enigma In Pseudo-Isaiah: A New Point Of View.
Heitzberger. Amsterdam. 1934.

Peake, A. S.
The Servant Of Yahweh And Other Lectures.
Manchester University Press. 1931.

Ploeg, J. S.
Les Chants du Serviteur de Jahve.
Gabalda. Paris. 1936.

Sellin, E.
Mose und seine Bedeutung fur die israelitisch-jüdische Religionsgeschichte.
Deichert. Leipzig. 1922.
Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der jüdischen Gemeinde nach dem babylonischen Exil.
Leipzig. 1901.
Serubbabel.
Leipzig. 1898.

Torrey, C. C.
The Second Isaiah.
Scribner's. New York. 1928.

WORKS ON THE RAS SHAMRA TEXTS

Bauer, H.
Die Gottheiten von Ras Shamra.
ZATW. 1933. Pp. 81-101.

Dhorme, P.
Deux tablettes de Ras Shamra.
Syria. Vol. 14. Pp. 229-237.
Premiere traduction des textes Pheniciens.
Revue Biblique. Lecoffre. Paris. 1931.

Eissfeldt, O.
Ras Shamra und Sanchunjaton.
Niemeyer. Halle. 1929.

Gaster, T. H.
The Combat Of Aleyan Baal And Mot. The Second Tablet.
JRAS. January. 1935.
The Ras Shamra Texts And The Old Testament.
Palestine Exploration Fund Bulletin. 1934. Pp. 141-148.

Langhe, R. de
Les Textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit.
Louvain. 1939.

Montgomery, J. A.
Notes On The Mythological Epic Texts From Ras Shamra.
JAOS. Vol. 53. Pp. 97 ff.
Ras Shamra Notes II.
JAOS. Vol. 54. Pp. 60 ff.

Montgomery, J. A. and Harris, Z. S.
The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts.
The American Philosophical Society Bulletin. Phila. 1935.

Schaeffer, C. F. A.
The Cuneiform Texts Of Ras Shamra-Ugarit.
Oxford University Press. London. 1939.

Virolleaud, C.
La Naissance des Dieux Gracieux et Beaux.
Syria. Vol. 14. Pp. 128-151
Les Inscriptions Cuneiform de Ras Shamra.
Syria. Vol. 10. Pp. 304-308.
Noveau Fragment du Poème de Mot et d'Aleyan Baal
Syria. Vol. 15. Pp. 226-243.
Un Nouveau Chant du Poème d'Alein Baal.
Syria. Vol. 13. Pp. 113-163.
Un Poème phénicien de Ras Shamra.
Syria. Vol. 12. Pp. 193-224.

Williams, W. G.
The Ras Shamra Inscriptions And Their Significance For The History Of Religion. AJSL. Vol. 51. Pp. 233-246.

WORKS ON APOCALYPTIC PROPHECY

Charles, R. H.
Apocalyptic Literature.
In HDB. Vol. 1. Pp. 109-110.

Lindblom, J.
Die Jesaja Apokalypse.
Harrassowitz. Leipzig. 1938.

Oesterley, W. O. E.
The Jews And Judaism During The Greek Period.
MacMillan. New York. 1941.

Terry, M. S.
Biblical Apocalyptics.
Eaton & Mains. New York. 1898.

OTHER WORKS USED IN THE DISSERTATION AND NOT INCLUDED IN THE ABOVE

Briggs, C. A.
Psalms. Vols. 1 & 2. In ICC.
Scribner's. 1906.

Davidson, A. B.
Hebrew Grammar. Twenty-fourth edition. Edited by J. E.
McFadyen. Scribner's. 1914.

Eissfeldt, O.
Einleitung In Das Alte Testament.
Mohr. Tübingen. 1934.

Fisher, W. W.
Isaiah And The Nature Cults.
The University Of Chicago. 1938.

Goodenough, E. R.
Kingship In Early Israel.
JBL. Vol. 48. Pp. 169-205.

Graham, W. C. & May, H.
Culture And Conscience.
University Of Chicago. 1936.

Gray, G. B.
Numbers. In ICC.
Scribner's. 1903.
Sacrifice In The Old Testament.
Clarendon Press. Oxford. 1925.

Harper, W. R.
Hosea. In ICC.
Scribner's. 1905.

Hooke, S. H.
Myth And Ritual.
Oxford University Press. London. 1933.
The Labyrinth.
S.P.C.K. London. 1935.

Knudtzon, J. A.
Die El-Armana Tafeln.
Leipzig. 1907.

Mowinckel, S.
Psalmenstudien. Vol. 2.
Dybwad. Kristiania. 1921.

North, C. R.
The Religious Aspects Of Hebrew Kingship.
ZATW. Vol. 50. Pp. 8 ff.

Skinner, J.
Genesis. In ICC.
Scribner's. 1910.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE FOOTNOTES AND THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABC. The Abingdon Bible Commentary. Abingdon Press. New York. 1929.

AJT. American Journal Of Theology. Chicago.

AJSL. American Journal Of Semitic Languages And Literature.

CAH. Cambridge Ancient History. Ed. by J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook. Cambridge, England.

CB. The Cambridge Bible For Schools And Colleges. Cambridge University Press.

HDB. Hasting's Dictionary Of The Bible. Scribner's. New York.

ICC. International Critical Commentary. Scribner's. New York.

JAOS. Journal Of The American Oriental Society. New Haven, Conn.

JBL. Journal Of Biblical Literature. New Haven, Conn.

JR. Journal Of Religion. Chicago.

JRAS. Journal Of The Royal Asiatic Society. London.

LXX. The Septuagint.

MT. The Massoretic Text.

NCB. The New Century Bible. Edinburgh.

S.P.C.K. Society For Promotion Of Christian Knowledge. London.

SYRIA. Syria, Revue d'art oriental et d'archeologie. Geuthner. Paris.

ZATW. Zeitschrift fur die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Toplemann. Giessen.

EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT A

THE OLD TESTAMENT USE OF THE VERB, מָשַׁח, TO ANOINT.

In A Non-Technical Sense

Jeremiah 22:14 Amos 6:6

Used In The Sense Of Consecrating Inanimate Objects To Holy Use

Genesis 31:13. Exodus 29:2,36. 30:26-29. Leviticus 8:10-11. 2:4
Numbers 6:15. Daniel 9:24

Used In The Sense Of Consecrating To The Office Of

King. Judges 9:8. I Samuel 15:1. 16:3. I Kings 1:34,45. II Kings 11:12
23:30. Psalm 89:21.

Prophet. I Kings 19:16. Isaiah 61:1 (Metaphorically).

Priest. Exodus 28:41. 19:7. 40:13,15. Leviticus 7:36. 8:12. Numbers 3:3

THE OLD TESTAMENT USE OF THE NOUN, מָשִׁיחַ, MESSIAH

The King. I Samuel 2:10. 24:7. II Samuel 23:1. Psalm 2:2. 20:6. 28:8
Etc.

The High Priest. Leviticus 4:3,5,16.

Cyrus. Isaiah 45:1.

The Patriarchs. Psalm 105:15.

The Messianic Prince. Daniel 9:25,36.

Zerubbabel. Haggai 2:23. Zechariah 3:8. 4:12.

EXHIBIT C

Various Translations Of אִם־לֹא יֹאמְרוּ כַּדָּבָר הַזֶּה Isaiah 8:20.

Ja, nach dem Gesetz und Zeugniss. Werden sie das nicht sagen, so werden sie die Morgenrote nicht haben.

--Luther

To the teaching of God and to the testimony! If they do not accord with this word, they are a people for whom no morning dawns.

--Delitzsch

If they speak not according to this word, there shall be no dawn to them.

--Henderson

Surely they will so say, to whom there is no dawn.

--Dillmann

Will they not yet so speak? Because no morning dawns for him, one goeth, etc.

--Bredenkamp

To the instruction and to the admonition! Surely they shall speak according to this word when there is no dawning for them.

--Cheyne

To the teaching and the testimony! Surely they tell of the like of this state, to which there is no dawn.

--Mitchell

To the law and to the testimony! If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.

--Skinner

To the law and the testimony! If they speak not thus, he shall have no dawning.

--Gray

They must speak according to the tale, "He To Whom There Is No Dawn". (What follows is a quotation from a book by this name).

--Robertson

EXHIBIT B

Poem C of the Ras Shamra Texts

Translated from the Fench of Virroleaud's version, published in Syria Vol. 14, P. 32.

1. I invoke the two gr(acious 2. and beautiful

The sons of p(rince?) 3. will give them a city for.....;

4. In the desert they ( )

5. On the head. and they (.....thei(r)) ( ) saying

6. "Eat bread ( )y, and drink wine (ynay)

7. O Shalem! You will carry on, (O) Shalem! the royalty over the Arabians and the Shenenites.

---

8. Mot-Shar sits down

(taking) in his hand the sceptre of infertility,

(holding) in his hand 9. the sceptre of sterility.

The pruners prune the stock,

10. the binders bind the stock,

they clear away (?) his vineyard 11. like the vine

---

12. Place the yrlm upon the 'd; and you will answer to the Arabians.

---

13. And work the field of the gods, the field of Asherat and of the merciful

14. Upon the fire, place the gzrm.

Cook a k)id in milk, and a (?) mmh in butter,

15. And put them upon the sea ( )

---

16. You will be (toward) them, (O) my (merciful Gods. And you will tell ( ).

17. You will surround Gazer, the (most) graci(ous of the gods) 18. and the men

Then the Arabians ( ) have.

19. See of the eight gods,

Re(sidence(?)) 20. of the seven Pamt.

21. I am jealous of the names (of the two gracious(?);

22. the sons of prince ( )

---

23. I invoke the gracious gods.

(I split the sea; the son of the sea 24. takes revenge upon the field of Asherat.

( ) 25. (O) Sun! Who is it (the thin cows) ( )

26. and the grapes, peaceful (offering) of the Arabians (and) the Shenenites,

27. walking in (the sight of) sacrifice (of graceful actions)

---

28. (O) field of the gods, field of Asherat, and of my merciful (god)

29. ( ) he will sit down.

---

30. ( ) (on) the surface of the sea,

and he moves forward (on) the surface of the ocean.

31. He ( ) the two mst'lt, the two mst'lt (who are) in the depth of the sea.

32. His hl, upon the hl, his hl arises;

His hl cries, "Ad! Ad!"

33. And his hl cries: "Mother! Mother!"

..... the hand of El like the sea

34. And the hand of El like the mdb.

..... the hand of El like the sea

35. And the hand of El like the mdb.

He takes the two mst 'lt

36. the two mst 'lt (who are) in the depth of the sea

He takes them and puts (them) in his house.

37. El who lowers his sceptre;

El ..... the trembling of his hand.

He raises 38. the yr towards the sky; the yr (he puts it) in the sky

the bird, he (it) ..... (and) he puts (it) 39. upon the coals.

When El had seduced his wives, here it is that the wives cry:

40. "O Mot, Mot! We are they who cause you to lower your sceptre, we (who make)

the trembling of your hand.

41. Is it (truly) the bird you will roast upon the fire, and the shrrt upon the coals?"

42. "O wives! wife of El and his servant!"

And here it is that (43) the wives cry:

"O Ab! Ab! (It is we who) cause you to lower your sceptre;

44. (we who)

make the trembling of your hand.

"Is it (truly) the bird you will roast upon the fire, 45. and
the shrrt over the coals?"

(O) Houses! House of El! House of El 46. and his servant!"

And here it is that the wives cry:

"O Mot! Mot! 47. (It is we who) cause you to lower your sceptre;
(we who) make the trembling of your hand.

"Is it (truly) the bird 48. you will cook over the fire, and
the shrrt over the coals?"

"O Wives! Wife of El! 49. Wife of El and his servant!"

He bends (over) their lips; (then) he raises (the voice saying):

50. "My, but your lips are sweet, sweet like a bunch of grapes (?)

51. In the kissing and conception, in embracing and the hmhmt,
she ..... 52. and she gives birth to Shahar and Shalem.

(Then) he sent to El (this) message:

"My wife 53. (O) El, has given birth."

"What has she borne?"

"Shahar and Shalem are born to me."

54. "Lift (then) the offering up to Sapas, the great (goddess) and up
to the stars ....."

55. He bends himself over their lips, then he raises (his voice,
saying:)

"My, but your lips are sweet!"

56. In the kissing and conception, in the embracing and the hmhmt,
he begins again (and ?) 57. he counts five .....

58. She ..... and she bore the gracious (gods) (saying),

I will split the sea; 59. the son of the sea will avenge himself upon the field of Set!"

(Then) he sent to El (this) message:

60. "My wife, (O) El has given birth."

"To what has she given birth?"

"(She has borne) me (?) two beautiful (saying)

61. I will split the sea! The son of the sea will avenge himself upon the field of Set!

The earth 62. has lips! the heavens have lips!

and what enters into their mouth (becomes) the bird of the heavens 63. and

the fish (which is) in the sea.

and the fugitive .....

and he disposes of the right 64. and the left in their mouth.

"And bear Sabani (O) wife of Etrali!

65, "He will build up Ashdod (?)

"Goddess the 'd in the middle of the desert of Qades.

66. "There. you ..... upon the rocks and upon the trees (during) seven years.

"You will kill the eight ngpt of the 'd of the gracious gods!

"You will go 68. in the plain! You will fight the boundaries of the desert, and their chief is Ngr 69. mdr'

"And (c)alls (?) them with Ngr-mdr' saying:

"O Ngr 70. mdr'! O(pen ? .....); and open it and enter in their 'd

71. "and enter (in) the hlg (?)

"Here it is that there is bread, and gives (it to us) 72. and we eat!

"Here it is that there is (wine ? ..... and gives it to us)
and we drink!"

73. And answers to them (0) Ngr mdr:

"( ) 74. There is wine. He who enters in .....
75. .....for them a log of his wine ..... 76. and
refills with wine his hbr.

EXHIBIT D.

An old Sumerian epic, giving a paradise picture similar to that in Isaiah, and used by Miss Louise Smith to show this thought antedates Isaiah. Cf. lines 13-21 with Isaiah 11:6-8.

"1. They that are lofty, they that are lofty are ye,
2. O, X pure,
3. They that are holy, they that are lofty are ye,
4. . . . .O, X pure.
5. X is pure, X is bright,
6. X is splendid, X is resplendent.
7. Alone were they in X they lay down.
8. Where Enki and his consort lay,
9. That place is splendid, that place is pure.
10. Alone in X they lay down.
11. Where Enki with Ninella lay down,
12. That place is splendid, that place is pure.
13. In X the raven cried not,
14. The kite gave not his kite-call,
15. The deadly lion destroyed not,
16. The wolf a lamb seized not,
17. The dog the weak kid worried not,
18. The ewes the food-grain destroyed not,
19. Offspring increased not. . .
20. The birds of heaven their offspring . . . not,
21. The doves were not put to flight (?)."

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

I, Philip Stephen Nason, was born in Kingston, New Hampshire, on October 4, 1899. My parents were Albion W. and Anna S. (Page) Nason. I was educated in the public schools of Kingston, and prepared for college at Sanborn Seminary in the same town. My undergraduate work was done at Bates College, Lewiston, Maine, from which institution I received the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1923 with honors in Philosophy. During my senior year in college, I was elected to membership in the Phi Beta Kappa honorary Fraternity. My college major was Greek. In the fall of 1926 I entered Boston University School of Theology, and was graduated with the Bachelor of Sacred Theology degree in 1926. The following year, I entered the Graduate School of Boston University and did graduate work in the field of Old Testament. In February of 1936 I returned to the Graduate School and completed my residence work for the Doctor of Philosophy degree.

In September of 1920, while a student at Bates College, I became pastor of the Methodist Church in Wayne, Maine, where I served until April, 1923. At that time, I became pastor of the Methodist Church at Merrimacport, Massachusetts. In 1925 I joined the New Hampshire Conference of the Methodist Church on trial and was ordained a deacon. Two years later, I was accepted into full membership in the conference, and was orgained an elder. In 1927 I was transferred to Saint Mark's Methodist Church, Lawrence, Massachusetts. I served this field for three years, and in April, 1930, was transferred to the First Methodist Church, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, which church I am now serving as pastor.

On August 31, 1927, I was married to Mildred G. Leather of Somerville, Massachusetts. We have two children: June Roberta, born June 13, 1928; and Beverly Gladys, born December 7, 1932.

For ten years I have taught Bible at the Northern New England School of Religious Education, which is held at the University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire. I served two years on the faculty of the Tilton Epworth League Institute at Tilton, New Hampshire, and for three years I acted as its dean. I have also taught in several leadership training schools.



BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02489 2459